

## THE THEOCRATIC COVENANTS



David Hill (26 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (1)"

*Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness  
and all these things shall be added unto you.*

*Except a Grain of Wheat fall into the ground and die  
it abides alone but if it dies it brings forth much fruit.*

### INTRODUCTION :

"Of all the topics of the day, none is of graver importance than the early history of Christianity, and the foundation of the Church. Everything points inquiry in this direction."

Peters quoting Pressense, Vol. 1, pg. 443

Because of the importance of this subject, I have put pen to paper in an effort to critique Mr. Peter's work, The Theocratic Kingdom, especially as I feel that there are some people who will read this who are themselves laboring through his monumental expose of the Premillennial faith; a critique that, as far as I know, has never been done.

Though I agree with perhaps 90-95% of his Propositions; and still highly recommend acquiring a copy of his book; the 5% that I feel are in error must be addressed mainly because, to some extent, they affect the Eschatology that will soon be fulfilled in our lifetime.

The significance of this is of primary importance, not specifically to the Church or to the southern nation of Judah, but to the northern nation of Ephraim, especially after the Pretrib rapture, when the Church dispensation will end. The importance of then remembering "The Law of my servant Moses" is primarily to prompt them to recognize their true ancestry; that this lost nation (America) is actually the Nation of Ephraim that is destined to fulfill prophecy in these end days (Gen 49, Dt 33, Num 23-24, Mic 6:5, Ez 37 etc).

The major propositions of his work that are affected by this critique are Numbers 46-52 however, a small host of other propositions are also, indirectly, affected. As well, as I am re-reading his work now, I have noticed that many of the other minor errors that I have found in his work, have already been addressed by many of my other posts, and would, therefore, be simply redundant in critiquing them again (all of which taken together still amount to less than 5% error in his exhaustive work, as compared to 50% error or better in most other prophetic authors I have read).

For those of you who may not be familiar with Mr. Peters work, I tried to edit this with you in mind so that you should derive some benefit from a reading of this material, especially since his work is considered the classic of the Premill faith by Chafer, Walvoord, Pentecost and Dallas Theo. Sem. as well as many others; but mainly because this critique focuses on the foundation of his great work and thus of this faith. I am quite sure you will be extremely interested in the section on the Transferral which gives a sure Key to understanding most, if not all, of the parables, including the ones that are still considered obscure by many knowledgeable Theologians.

I have tried to streamline this series as much as possible so there should be little, if any, redundancy; and I would encourage taking the time to refer to the Scripture passages mentioned which will solidify this information in your minds.

Let it be understood that this endeavor is not for the purpose of criticizing his "sacrifice of love" for I am, perhaps, his greatest student. Nor is it an attempt to gain fame or publicity off of his labor. The intended spirit is one of a desire to correct error to the truth wherever it may be found. Since I am sure that Mr. Peters loves the truth as much as I do, I am convinced that he would receive this critique willingly, and would apply himself to it, accompanied by a search of the Scriptures, to see if the things I say are true.

"Every writer should feel willing and desirous that his work should be subjected to rigid examination and criticism, but only in the spirit inculcated by the Divine Master, and in the Light of the Holy Scriptures." (Vol 3 pg 233)

I hope that herein he would find a critique worthy of the degree of his labor, and in the spirit of our Divine Master. And, in that Kingdom that he obviously loves so much, we will get a chance to sharpen each others Theological Irons face to face, and not through the shadows of time that separated us from that blessed fellowship in our Messiah.

TO GOD BE THE GLORY

David T. Hill

Sept 2, 2003

George N.H. Peters, The Theocratic Kingdom, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Mi Copyright 1988

Originally published by Funk and Wagnal, 1884

Emphasis in quotes are the Author's throughout

The Theocratic Kingdom online :

[Volume One](#) [Volume Two](#) [Volume Three](#)

David Hill (26 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (2)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

### **APOLOGY :**

Before I get into the critique itself; because of the volume of this series of posts and their importance; I felt compelled to make an "apology" for it in this regard. This can best be done by quoting the author's own "apology" or reason for his belief and subsequent publishing of the same.

I can't help but also remark that critiquing Mr. Peters work (which I have been doing over the past 4 years or more, off and on, when I would use it as a reference tool) suddenly became an obsession over the last couple of weeks and I couldn't drag myself away from the work until it was completed. The speed and ease with which this post came together (regardless of all prior labor) surprised me and it almost seemed as if Mr. Peters was himself sitting beside me as a personal guide to his own work. This was especially noticeable in the compilation of this very apology which quotes, normally, would have been almost impossible to find even with his index (authors, subjects and scriptures) which he included with his publication - an incredible labor in

itself. This led me to believe that there is an urgency and importance to this critique that is greater by far, than either myself or Peters.

There is a formation in the Heavens and if, for some reason, your attention is drawn skyward on a memorable starlit night, you might see it - shining in brilliance and as straight as an arrow, as it courses through its appointed celestial rounds. It is actually called Sagitta - the Arrow. In the mythologies, it is a stray arrow that accidentally killed one of the gods. However, their understanding is not completely correct for, if you trace the trajectory of this missile, it passes through the wings of Pegasus (type of the Holy Spirit) and speeds on its way right to the Heart of Cetus - the Whale, which we know is a type of the World System. However, this arrow bears a post to an intended audience and not specifically the rulers of this world, though they will, assuredly and speedily, feel the Cutting Edge.

What that message may be is probably still debated in some shadowy circles, as there are no star names left to shed any light. However, since it has been shown that the Revelation in the Stars (Ps 19) is exactly parallel to the Revelation in the Scriptures; and since Peters has shown that the Great Theme of the Word (and the Stars) is the Theocratic Kingdom; and since that Kingdom is founded on the Oath-Bound Covenants of God, then it is obvious that the arrow bears the Heavenly counterpart of those covenants. I have previously shown that the Gravel Tipped Arrows are the Glorified Saints ("Lightnings" of Ps 77), so with Sagitta and this post shot in haste, or on the fly, or en passant if you will; what we have is (Mal 3:1, Dan 11:22), the Messenger of the Theocratic Covenant.

George Peters, The Theocratic Kingdom

"In this faith we are fortified by the predictions of the Word, which unmistakably teach that they will find but little acceptance by the world, and even with the Church at large, and that they will only be pondered and received by the thoughtful few. In this period of prosperity, of sanguine hope of continued and ever-increasing peace and happiness, the minds and hearts of the multitude will be closed against all appeal, all instruction. It is only when the dreadful storm of persecution and death, alluded to in several propositions, shall, when excited and marshaled by the elements and forces now at work, burst with dreadful violence upon the Church, and beat with pitiless vehemence upon the heads of true, unflinching believers, in Christ, that this work will find a cordial response, a hearty welcome in the breasts of the faithful. Time with its startling and terrible events will justify this publication. When the dreams of fallible men, now so universally held as the prophetic announcements of God, are swept away by stern reality; when, instead of the fondly anticipated blessedness and glory to be brought about by existing agencies, the blood of man shall again stain and steep the soil of earth with its precious crimson, then will the doctrine of the Kingdom, as here taught, be regarded worthy of the highest consideration, and then will it also become a solace, hope, and joy under tribulation." (Vol 1, pg 24)

"Hence, the writer consistently claims that his labors will not be in vain; that they will at least some day be esteemed in the degree that they sustain to the Bible." (Vol 1, pg 24)

"Indeed, so fully persuaded is the writer of the certainty of this - judging simply from past and present fulfillment - that the hope of writing for that very period - of warning the weak in faith not to yield, of encouraging the believing to suffer and endure to the end, of cautioning the doubting how to decide, and of admonishing all, friends and foes, what they must expect - has greatly sustained him in his labor." (Vol 3, pg 298)

"We dare not, with our convictions of duty, do less; and hence, therefore, even those who may not be willing to receive what is here asserted, will, at least, credit us with being deeply impressed by a sense of responsibility in this matter, seeing that in the immediate connection of Antichrist, the spirit (Rev 13:9) says: "If any man have an ear, let him hear," - a phrase most expressive that the matter at hand is one of special importance and deserving of our closest attention. We constantly feel too, that we are not so much writing for the present time as for the time of tribulation to come. When the true Church finds herself struggling amid the thickest gloom, and the false predictions of peace, safety and prosperity are found delusive; when the world instead of being converted, is found arrayed against the truth, reason holding the sway in place of faith, and the Word of God is adjured and derided as unworthy of enlightened man; when the multitude follow wondering after the Beast, the Antichrist, and a bloody death, or a dastardly forsaking and denial of Christ is presented as the only alternative; when there is no hope or way of escape, and the godly among men are to cease amid the penalties of image-worship, then it is that anything and everything that can throw light upon the painful situation will be eagerly accepted and pondered. The Bible will be read and searched with increasing interest - intensified by actual trial and suffering - and everything illustrative of the times then existing will be most carefully examined. Then it is that such a work as this - perhaps now derided and sneered at by some professed believers - will be thankfully perused and its deductions from the Scriptures gratefully contrasted with the then existing manifestations and the Divine Original. It is both an honor and a privilege to write for such a period, thus becoming, by God's grace, instrumental in upholding the faith and consoling the hearts of martyrs, of sustaining men and women under Antichrist's cruel rule by the assurance that this very trial shall redound, if faithful, to their everlasting honor and glory (Rev 20:4,6)." (Vol 2, pg 733)

"God will raise up instruments...who will so distinctly announce the order of events, so vividly represent the nature of the Kingdom, point out its manner of manifestation, give a precise understanding of the Church's actual relationship to the world and this Kingdom, that the Church will be prepared to endure the awful scenes awaiting her, and that the saints, called to suffer loss of life, may, in the thus revealed will of God, find encouragement and comfort instead of disappointment and despair. With the hope of being thus honored with others as an instrument in upholding the faith of God's dear children in the darkest period of the Church's history, one will sadly but cheerfully endure the censures of mistaken zeal and bigotry, and give his days and years of wearisome labor as an inspiring sacrifice of love." (Vol 1, pg 24)

"What causes such a change in the style and preaching, which will result in the conversion, as parallel passages show, of very many, preparing them to pass through the great tribulation, and to suffer death rather than to worship the Best and his image? Nothing less than [the]

astonishing removal of certain chosen ones, accounted worth, owing to their distinctive faith in God's promises, to escape. Let this event occur just as it is described; let here one and there one of the believing and watching be taken, and surely those who believe in God's Word and are left behind will be most wonderfully affected by the event. By one sudden and startling event, coming home to the heart and directly appealing to the warmest affections, the prevailing spiritualization systems and theories of progressive advancement and perfection will be overthrown, and the Millenarian doctrine, once derided and sneered at as "carnal," etc., will be most eagerly embraced and proclaimed. (The writer has often, often felt, that it was specially for this period that he is laboring, when his work will be appreciated, etc.) The Church, then starting up with Abrahamic faith will recognize its chronological position, will see what is before it, and, energetically infused by fear and hope, prepare itself for the fearful ordeal through which it must pass. And we are assured that the Church in this contest, overpowered as she will be, will sustain the persecution with triumphant faith; feeling convinced from the events occurring and the time elapsed, that the Son of Man is even already present, waiting for the moment of direct interference." (Vol 2, pg 130)

David Hill (26 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (3)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

### **CONFIRMATION :**

"Language could not possibly make it any plainer or stronger. The Sun may refuse to shine, the Moon and Stars may depart, the sea may no longer war with its waves, day and night may not alternate in their season, the ordinances of heaven and earth may be repealed (comp. e.g. Jer 33:17-26, Is 54:9, Jer 31:35-36, Ps 89:36-37, etc.), but the promises of God shall not fail in restoring the overthrown Davidic Kingdom; God will perform the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David and the prophets, respecting the Jewish nation. Men may foolishly ridicule and sneer at these things because still unrealized, calling them "Jewish notions, fables, and prejudices," but God's Word stands pledged, as solemnly and sacredly as word can be substantiated, for their fulfillment." (Vol 2, pg 283)

The Theocratic Kingdom of our Lord is rooted in the covenants in the Old Testament, as Peters says, confirmed by the oath of God himself (compare this with Num 30:2 and his quote above becomes conclusive, "If a man vow a vow unto Y'hova, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceeds out of his mouth."), and will see their literal fulfillment (Vol 1, pg 342) in our day and age. No understanding of the Kingdom, and the Scriptures, and prophecies relating to it, can be properly understood, as intended by the Holy Spirit, outside of these covenants, (Vol 1 pg 293). And he himself has done an excellent job in expounding these covenants, far and above any other writer since the days of the Apostles.

However, in one particular he is in error, and (if you look at the quote you may notice) that is in the teaching of the Mosaic Covenant (Ex 34, Lev 26 etc) as it stands in its proper relation to the

Abrahamic Covenant (Gen 12:1-7, 13:14-17, 15:4-21, 17:4-16, 22:15-18) and the Davidic Covenant (2 Sam 7:10-16, 1 Chr 17:11-14, Ps 89), as well as how all three of these relate to the New Covenant (Jer 30-33). This error, in turn, affects his view of Eschatology to some extent. All these points will be addressed in this critique. We will first look at "the Old Covenant" which, I believe, is referring to the first three Covenants, then we will properly relate them to the New, and correct any major errors to the prophecies that have resulted.

To any Jewish readers who (like one of my friends in Israel) take offense to the phrase "Old Covenant"; you can look at it in the same basic sense that we refer to the "Old" World.

Basically, the view that is incorrect is that the Mosaic Covenant is "inferior" to the Ab. and Dav., that it was never intended to be permanent and that, since 70 AD, it has been dis-annulled, never to be heard from again. The truth, however, is that this covenant, as the others, is the Revelation of God to His chosen nation and in no way is it inferior to the other two, for it is as much the Word of God as they are.

"It has been remarked by various writers, that the Covenant name of Jehovah or Jahveh, by which the unchangeableness of God is expressed, indicates the absolute certainty of ultimate fulfillment." (Vol 1, pg 287)

It is noteworthy that Peters; though emphasizing the fact that the Ab. and Dav. Covenants were both confirmed by an oath from God; fails to point out that the Mosaic Covenant itself was not only confirmed by oath, but that the very covenant keeping name, Y'hova, as stated above, was given to the Nation of Israel under the Mosaic Covenant (per Moses' specific request - Ex 3:13) and not under the Ab. or Dav. Covenants. That covenant keeping name and personage is further revealed to Moses (Ex 34:5-10), again at his request (33:13), specifically so that Moses may know that "this nation is thy people." It is incredible to me that this Eternal God would make the Ab. and Dav. covenants perpetual, but make the Mos. temporary, even when sealing it with His own covenant keeping name and personality under sworn oath. The quote above, in this light, is conclusive.

"The Jews had the strongest possible assurance given to them that the Kingdom based on these covenants would be realized. Attention has already been directed to the fact that the prophecies pertaining to this Kingdom shall not, in their ultimate fulfillment, fail, i.e., they are unconditional. The reason for this is that they are evolved from covenants confirmed by oath; and hence, in view of their absolute certainty (no matter how postponed), God has given expression to language which affirms beyond all doubt that this Kingdom, sustaining a covenant relationship, would at some time in the future be established; and this, too, as covenanted in connection with the national salvation of the Jewish nation." (Vol 1, pg 287)

The fact that this covenant was also confirmed by oath is specifically stated by Moses himself (Dt 28:90 - referring to either Ex 34 and/or Lev 26), and the reasons for the covenant are specified, again, as "Y'hova shall establish thee for an Holy People unto Himself as He has sworn to thee." The Mos. Covenant was basically designed to take the descendants of Abraham

and forge them into a Holy Nation. Without the Mosaic Covenant the Abrahamic Covenant could never be realized and the Davidic Covenant becomes a moot point (as history proves). This covenant is a necessary link in the chain that ends in the New Covenant itself, and to make the Mos. inferior in any way, to these others, weakens the whole.

The condition ("if you obey") does not affect the Covenant itself, only the timing of its realization. This statement is proven by Moses saying (Dt 7:6-12) that the nation already was "an Holy People unto the LORD thy God" (see also Dt 14:2 and 21, 26:17-19 emphatically, Dt 27:9, 29:13) in fulfillment of the sworn oath, and that if they did break the covenant (symbolized by Moses breaking the first set of stone commandments carved out by God Himself, denoting the Deity of Christ, and engraved by the finger of God - the Holy Spirit - in perfect type of the breaking of God's own Son to ratify the New Covenant), that he would still remember it (Lev 26:44-46, Dt 4:30-40, 8:18) and fulfill the promises contained in it despite of the sin of the nation (symbolized by Moses carving out the second set of stone commandments denoting another individual like Y'shua but not divine, and engraved by the finger of God - the indwelling Holy Spirit - as a result of the New Covenant).

All of this is confirmed in "the song of Moses" (Dt 32) shortly before his death; that the nation of Israel is God's inheritance and that, by oath, He will execute vengeance on those nations that persecute his people, which we know occurs during the trib and (from context) after they had rejected Messiah. The Church dispensation (The New Covenant) has not abolished this oath-bound Mosaic Covenant (any more than it has the Abrahamic or Davidic) as some suppose, for, likewise, in the above mentioned passage (Lev 26), in the latter days, when they are in tribulation, the Lord will still remember his covenant with "them" (vs 44 - the nation and not the patriarchs), when they heard "the voice of God" and which is reiterated in Malachi (4:4) when he calls them to "remember the law of my servant Moses" (and not the covenant with Abraham) before the coming of the dreadful day of the Lord, when Elijah returns and "restores all things" including, assuredly, this covenant.

So, we see that the fact that the Mosaic Covenant was confirmed by an oath from the covenant keeping God Himself, re-elevates it back to its original standing as the next link in the covenant chain.

"This already gives us the clue to the literal fulfillment of the covenant promises, confirmed as they are by the oath of God, and therefore unconditional. Thus e.g. the promise of making Abraham's seed a mighty nation...will be realized when this elect nation will all be gathered and stand associated with the restored Theocratic Kingdom." (Vol 1, pg 416)

David Hill (26 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (4)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

**PERPETUITY :**



"Let it be observed that in approaching the covenants we are not at liberty to receive one and reject another, nor are we authorized to take just as much as may suit our Theological views out of one and refuse to believe in the rest. Here is where many Theological writers make the fatal mistake: They are willing to receive the Abrahamic Covenant as a perpetual one, but not the Davidic, when the same perpetuity is asserted of both; they are agreed to receive part of the Abrahamic or part of the Davidic Covenant, but not all that is written. No wonder that A diversity is thus produced, and an antagonism to the Old Test." (Vol 1, pg 285-6)

The two main points that Peters presents to prove the importance of the Ab. and Dav. covenants are that of their eternal nature and that they were confirmed by an oath from God himself. These same two points apply with equal force to the Mosaic Covenant, confirming its importance to the nation of Israel today. We have already shown that, indeed, contrary to popular opinion, the Mosaic Covenant was in fact ratified by the Solemn Oath of Y'hova, the Eternal Covenant Keeping God. Now we can also show, easily I might add, that the Mosaic Covenant, like the Abrahamic and Davidic, is also specifically stated to be perpetual (Dt 4:40).

As previously stated, God's Eternal Name is also His Covenant Keeping name originally given to Moses "forever in all generations" (Ex 3:15), and thus, the call of Moses to the nation is an everlasting one (compare Gen 13:15 and Mt 22:32 - seen from this point of view, this actually strengthens the belief that Moses; the one to whom the Eternal One revealed himself; will be back as one of the two witnesses). Along these lines, in reference to the alleged abrogation of the Ab. Covenant Peters says, "If the fulfillment is conditioned by the disobedience of the unfaithful portion, are the pious Jews to miss the promises of the Kingdom on account of the wickedness of others? This opens an abyss for our opponents. At present, it may only be said that such a course would neither be just to man nor honorable to the oath bound promises of God." (Vol 1, pg 186)

Thus; is the entirety of Moses' life work to be dis-annulled by the unbelief of some in the nation, or himself in a moment of anger? This question, ultimately, will be answered either by the return of Moses or some one else in his place; for Peter's statement above, as he states elsewhere (Vol 1, pg 296) requires a resurrection of the Patriarchs, including Moses which, for aught we know, occurred three days later after his death in perfect type of Y'shua's resurrection. In this same vein, keep in mind that Y'shua loved and perfectly fulfilled God's Word in the Torah and He was faithful in its complete application to his life. This alone is a strong persuasion on this point.

The Passover Sacrifice, which God ordained when He brought His people out of Egypt is a feast "throughout your generations forever" (Ex 12). The importance of this is that they were to be an Holy People unto the Lord. Holy, basically, means set apart and it is the Exodus and this Passover meal that sets them apart from the World and other nations. Thus, the Holy Nature of their God, reflects on this nation and is symbolized perpetually by this feast, which even the Christian Church celebrates to this day.

The Sign (or token - Gen 9:12, 17:7-14) of the covenant, which was to honor the Sabbath, was "throughout your generations forever" (Ex 31:16-17). Likewise, their separation "unto the Lord" was accomplished at Sinai and forever memorialized by the Sign of the Sabbath. And, it is this Sign that, more than anything else, has kept the nation itself from being absorbed back into the world and thus, in fulfillment of prophecy, has ensured the perpetuity of them as a separate people. And, as Peters has shown elsewhere, the nation itself, as a nation, is a perpetual nation. Thus, as long as they exist as a nation, so too will the Mosaic Covenant. This is further strengthened by this Sign of the Sabbath being forever linked to the original ten commandment stones which God personally carved out and handed to Moses (vs 18) just after giving him the Sign of these commandments. We know from Barnabas in Hebrews 4, that Y'shua himself is the personification of this Sabbath rest, so to the unprejudiced reader, the perpetuity of the Mosaic Covenant is, literally, carved in stone (denoting permanence). Keep in mind that Y'shua is typified by these very stones.

The Priesthood of the covenant is perpetual (Num 18, Dt 18, Ex 40), as were all the feasts (Lev 23 etc), and the Trumpets (Num 10), and Temple when built (Lev 17), in which the perpetual Menorah was to shine (Lev 24, Ex 27:21), and the twelve memorial loaves forever displayed (Lev 24), and the covenant of salt honored (Lev 2:13, Num 18:19). These all are important because they are the earthly counterpart to the Heavenly reality and reveal the same to us concerning the Wisdom and World of God. As long as the reality exists in Heaven then, assuredly, the earthly "schoolmaster" will also exist.

"The Tabernacle was made according to a pattern furnished, and that there is deep significance in it, being "a shadow of good things to come" (Heb 10:1). Now, aside from the ceremonial and sacrificial aspects, the reader is reminded that the Tabernacle was Theocratically associated, and therefore relates to the Theocratic Ordering...the personal dwelling of God there, the manifestation of His glory, His enthronement as the earthly Ruler, the patterning after the heavenlies, the place of meeting and witness, the divine superintendence and devising, the exhibition of beauty and splendor, "the seat of the divine Kingdom on earth," the accessibility to the King, the holiness belonging to it, the special consecration pertaining to it, the priesthood connected with it, the worship and homage tendered, the honorable and dignified service attached to it [Mk 11:17], the removal of the one class from all servile employment and their exclusive possession by God, the intermediary service between the King and the subjects, the personal purity and adornment required, the clear and unmistakable revelation of the divine will - all typify a similar condition and aspect in the restored Theocracy. It is only typical (comp. e.g. Jer 3:16-17, Zech 14:20-21 etc) of a corresponding exhibition, on a grander scale, of "the Glory of the Lord," of Theocratic rule, of special nearness to the King, of required consecration and holiness, of participation in the favor and blessing of God." (Vol 2, pg 568-9)

The second giving of the Law was also forever (Dt 12:28) and even the Curses, if disobedient, were forever (Dt 28:46). And, finally, the Secret Things that God revealed in the Mosaic Covenant are ours forever (Dt 29:29).

Now, if only one of the items above were called perpetual by Y'hova, it would still, ultimately, necessitate the perpetuity of the Mosaic Covenant ("whatever God does will last forever"), but when taken altogether it actually strengthens the case for the perpetuity of the Mosaic Covenant far above that of the Abrahamic or Davidic by sheer volume alone. But, what it amounts to is that all three covenants are perpetual, on the sworn oath of God and led us to Messiah, who confirmed the New Covenant in which the curses of the Mosaic will be left in the tomb (Gal 3:13, Rom 7:2), and all covenants will find their fulfillment in Y'shua in the Kingdom.

Perhaps it would be well to state here that the belief that the Mos. Cov. was voided is primarily drawn from Heb 8:13, "in that he says, a New Covenant, he has made the first old. Now that which decays and waxes old is ready to vanish away." Some say that this means that the Mosaic is now done away with, however, not only is the statement in the future tense (it had not passed away yet, during the Church age), but this is also in contradiction to Y'shua's words that he came to fulfill the (Mosaic) law and that "one jot or tittle" would not pass from the Law until all was fulfilled. This will not be the case until death and hell are cast into the lake of fire at the end of the Mill, when death finally dies. It is, then, to this time that Barnabas is referring to and thus, after the millennium, when the human race, as a race, is redeemed and sinless, and the curse removed and the earth renewed, then the need for the sacrificial system will "vanish away." But even that does not make void any of the covenants as such, including the Mosaic, but it will be the ultimate intended fulfillment of them.

Our Lord's word also addresses the author's comment that the destruction of the Temple "intimated...the abrogation of the Mosaic Law." (Vol 1, pg 373). And, even if this were allowed (under protest), Y'shua "intimated" the rebuilding of the Temple three days later which, by the author's own principles of interpretation, implies the resurrection of the Mosaic Covenant itself, which gave us that Temple and Priesthood.

The other passages that are used to prove the abolishment of the Mos. Cov. are misunderstood in their real teaching. Ephesians shows that it is not the Law, per se, that is abolished (Eph 2:14-16) but the resulting "enmity" between believing Gentiles and Jews that resulted from the Law (note vs 15 "even" is in italics and thus not part of the original and probably should read "of" and "contained" is the same verse should read "and"). Compare this with Gal 2:12-19, where this "wall" of separation (which was over emphasized by the "traditions of men" vs 1:14 and Mt 15:9 etc), was acted out by Peter who "built again" (vs 18) that wall. That this is the Apostle's reasoning can easily be adduced from an unbiased reading of Rom 2:17-20, where he calls the Law "His Will" and "the things that are more excellent," as contrasted not with the New Covenant (as the author or "Jesus the Jewish Theologian" states) but with the Laws of the other nations that necessitates "the wall" to keep Israel a distinct nation even in exile. This wall was broken down between Gentile and Jewish believers, but not between the Jewish and Gentile nations, where the enmity, obviously, still exists (Vol 1, pg 392). Note especially Rom 3:1-4 and that the Law, to this day (3:30, 4:16), continues (vs 19) to shut every mouth, and (vs 2) to witness to "the righteousness of God" (Mt 6:33), by faith in Y'shua, in which we, the Church, "establish the Law" (vs 31), not by observing the Mosaic rituals, but because the Law has been written on our hearts and we fulfill the righteous requirements thereof.

David Hill (27 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (5)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

### **UNITY:**

"The view, adopted by some, that it [Mosaic Covenant] is a separate and distinct covenant, simply provisional without a direct and vital union existing between it and the others, is justly held by many able writers to be erroneous and misleading - a violation of Scripture statements." (Vol 1, pg 312)

That there is a divinely commissioned unity of all the covenants, including the Mosaic, the author notes time and again, showing that, really (from our perspective), all the covenants were resultant from the Abrahamic and simply enlarge upon it, as the nation grows. This, he himself extends even to the New Covenant.

"In the simple covenant words, in their gradually unfolded purpose, in their continuous progress in and toward fulfillment, in their fundamental relationship to Messianic hopes, etc., we have the most triumphant vindication...of the equality and truthfulness of all divine revelation, and of the significance and fundamental importance of the covenants, and also a rebuke to the foolishness of a learned display of unbelief." (Vol 1, pg 286)

He then, in contrast to this, shows that the early Church upheld the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants (referencing Barnabas, Ireneus, Justin, Tertullian) and totally ignores the Mosaic (which either Ireneus or Ignatius stated was still in effect), thus weakening his own argument of the "equality" in the covenant record.

"The relation that the Kingdom sustains to "the covenants of promise," enables us to appreciate the prophecies pertaining to the Kingdom. All predictions, all promises, all preparative measures, relating to the Kingdom, are based on, and result from, these covenants. The prophecies constantly keep in view what God has covenanted and confirmed by oath and enlarge and expand the same by amplification, explanation, etc. Therefore, to appreciate the utterances of the prophets, notice must continually be taken of the foundation upon which they are erected, to isolate them is to defeat one intent of prophecy, viz.: to instruct us in the manner in which God will ultimately fulfill His covenants and establish His Theocratic Rule over the Nations." (Vol 1, pg 337)

The author shows that provision for the New Cov. was contained in the Abrahamic (Gal 3:8, Heb 4:2), as well, provision for the Monarchy, though absent from the Ab. was made in the Mosaic (Num 23:21, Dt 17) as well as the New (Dt 30:6 compare Rom 2:29 both of which found, in essence, in Jer 31). And, really, all the covenants have foretold of Messiah himself (the Seed

according to Paul), so that the blessings of the Abrahamic are continued into the Mosaic and Davidic and reach their climax in the New Covenant under Messiah.

"The Messiahship of the promised David's son is delineated in the Old Test., and in deciding the doctrinal question of the Messiahship of Jesus, the question must be answered, whether the Christ of the New Test. corresponds in all respects with the Christ covenanted and promised in the Old." (Vol 1, pg 162)

You can not simply remove the Mosaic from the chain without damaging the whole. It was the Mosaic that ensured that "all God's people" would be prophets. The Levitical Priesthood was for the "healing" of the Nation. All these benefits and more, that are contained in the Mosaic (and not in the others) would be lost if the Mosaic Covenant is done away with; not the least of which being the comforting knowledge of the Eternal One found therein.

"Hence, in interpreting prophecy, it should be observed how it is founded on, and united with, the covenants; and any interpretation, however plausible, which militates against them, which contradicts or changes their promises, should at once be discarded as of foreign origin. For it is unreasonable to suppose that God will invalidate the most solemnly given of all His revelations, or that the Spirit will deliberately contradict Himself in His utterances." (Vol 1, pg 337)

His last sentence seems out of place, and the author included it because of his subsequent treatment of the promises contained in the closing, millennial chapters of Ezekiel (Vol 3, pg 83), which he spiritually applies to the Church (because of his perceived "contradiction"), which shows that his view of the Mosaic Covenant is faulty and needs to be corrected.

"Hence, the predictions of the Old and New Test., unless viewed in the Light of the Covenant, cannot be duly apprehended. They only form additional links to a previously forged chain, and the places in which they fit must be found and matched. God having supplied the material, and given the Key for placing them in the covenants, is pleased with the faith that honors His oath-bound word." (Vol 1, pg 338)

It is, after all, the faith of His Son (John 18:11, Phil 2:5, Heb 12:2).

David Hill (27 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (6)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

### **NATIONALITY :**

It has been necessary for me to recreate, if at all possible, the sixth section of my critique of Peters work for the copy of it in the Wayback Machine has now come up missing which is strange, to say the least, since I originally salvaged it from them when I started my website up on the Theocratic Kingdom.

Be that as it may there were two main points that I wanted to make with this Section and some of the quotes from his material I was able to include below which was in the original posting and is, assuredly, what caused my enemies to delete it.

I believe that I presented two main points in this section and that was that the first establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom under Moses was not a "partial" fulfillment or establishment as Peters suggested but that, in fact, since it lasted for four hundred years under the Judges and another 400 years under the Monarchy that it was a literal establishment of the Kingdom on this earth.

Secondly, in proving that this was offered to the nation of Israel, as was the New Covenant, then this proves that the "other nation" mentioned by Y'shua could only be the Northern Nation of Ephraim represented by the 12 Apostles.

"The Kingdom is offered to an elect nation, viz.: the Jewish Nation."

This election is so plainly stated in Scripture, and it is so currently admitted in our theological works, that it needs no proof. Such passages as Deut. 7:6 and 14:2, Rom. 11:28 and 9:11, etc, are decisive, that the sovereignty of God chose in the descendants of Abraham, the Jews, a people through whom should be manifested his Divine purpose in the salvation of man.

"This election is not to be regarded, as some tell us, an act of favoritism, but as founded in that wisdom which adopted it (as the end will manifest) as the best means, under the circumstances in which fallen humanity was placed, to reach, consistently with moral freedom, the largest portion of mankind, having in view the ultimate establishment and triumph - in opposition to depravity - of God's Kingdom."

If memory serves, I used the quote above in the original to emphasize the fact to the reader that it was the Mosaic Covenant that forged this people into the Theocratic Kingdom at this time and it is impossible to divorce the Nation - verily the Theocratic Kingdom - from the Mosaic Covenant.

It is, to some extent, similar to the Constitution of the United States that forged those original thirteen colonies into an independent nation and you really cannot separate this country from its constitution.

"The Kingdom was offered to this chosen, elected nation, as is evinced, e.g., in Ex. 19:5,6, where it is declared that if faithful and obedient, it should be God's 'perculiar treasure above all people', and it should become 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.'"

Though I doubt he intended it, the reader could draw the conclusion that the nation did not fulfill the description and, therefore, they failed to be God's chosen people however, the statement was made by Moses that, in fact, they had become God's Chosen People, a Kingdom of Priests

and even a Holy Nation and thus there is no room for discarding the fact that the Theocratic Kingdom was established by Y'hova at Mt. Sinai (Dt. 14:2 see also 26:18 and Ps 135:4).

"The Kingdom itself thus offered to them is a divine-political (church and state united) dominion, over which God Himself, as an earthly Ruler, presides or rules as the Supreme. Moses and the Prophets clearly show this by constantly uniting the divine and the political in their instructions; by making God's commands, both civil and religious, the sovereign law; by stating that the object of the nation's call, and the bestowment of peculiar privileges and power, was the overruling and superseding of all earthly governments, thus exalting their God and King over all; and by teaching that through the Kingdom thus established, all nations should ultimately be brought under the subjection and allegiance of the great King."

"It is a refreshing omen to see men hostile to our views, still admit, as Neander, etc, that God's purposes in relation to this Kingdom must inevitably - if Scripture is fulfilled - exhibit itself in a great, outward political world dominion, under divine rule and guidance. Hundreds of quotations...from eminent men attest that such is the scriptural idea. Men, too, like Dr. Arnold, feel that the biblical idea of such a dominion has been kept in the background, and they strive to revive it, but mistake the time and manner of its manifestation, attributing to this dispensation and to present means what Holy Writ ascribes to the following dispensation and to Jesus Christ."

"Such deep thinkers as Rothe are nearer the truth, and coincide with prophecy, when they make the church, as now existing, but a temporary institution, making it to be united with the state in one great theocratic ordering, and the realization of such a permanent union depending on the future personal manifestation of the Savior Jesus. Look at the end contemplated, as predicted by the prophets (e.g. Zech. 14:9, etc), and given in the last testimony of Jesus (Apoc. 11:15,etc), and this is the grand position that the Kingdom of God is to attain: absolute control over all the kingdoms of the earth - such a world-wide dominion that all nations shall bend in joyful, blessed obedience to its behests. This was the Kingdom offered to the Jewish nation."

David Hill (27 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (7)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

### **NATURE :**

"The Theocracy was not simply preparatory but initial, in the sense of it being a real Kingdom of God, which was established in order to show forth to the nations of the earth the distinguished blessings flowing from it...the Theocracy did not adumbrate something else but was itself the Kingdom of God in its initiatory form - a commencement of that rule of God's as earthly King...It is the beginning of just such an infallible rule as humanity needs; and in its permanent distinctive features is indicative of wisdom transcendentally superior to that established in all other forms of government." (Vol 1, pgs 223,219)

It should first be stated that he breaks the force of his statement above by adding "in its initiatory form" which he does solely in light of his view of the inferiority of the Mosaic Covenant. This was not the "initial" establishment of the Kingdom proven by the full intention of God on making it permanent. It was the Kingdom of God on Earth, and, as he proves, it is the same Kingdom of God that will be restored. They lived under its Divine Rule for over 400 years before they asked for the King, during which time they did honor the Jubilee system (see the History of the Jubilee) as the sounding of the Trumpet in 1 Sam 13:3 "throughout the land" indicates (compare Lev 25:9). It was the establishment of the Monarchy under Saul that ended this period of the Judges and the honoring of the Jubilee. This is hardly initial as the average lifespan of a country of prominence is about 200 yrs. The Monarchy itself lasted approximately another 400 yrs after this. So, there was an eight hundred year period allotted to this "initial" establishment of the Kingdom showing that it was much more than that, and that God fully intended (and still does) on making it permanent (See Vol 2, pg 453 for his opinion of the history of the Jubilee cycle in Israel).

Now, the Mosaic Covenant did not just form Israel into a nation, important as this was. It was the establishment of the Theocracy on this earth with God "married" to the Nation in an Eternal, oath-bound, covenanted relationship. It is incredible to me, after pondering his work for years now, that the very subject of his book, should be divorced from the covenant that God used to institute that Kingdom. You cannot separate the two, and the restoration of the Theocracy demands the restoration of the National Mosaic Covenant.

"The simple fact is, that since the overthrow of the Hebrew Theocracy, God has not acted in the capacity of earthly ruler, with a set form of Government, for any nation or people on earth; and the application of the word to any Nation or people, or organization since then, is a perversion and prostitution of its plain meaning." (Vol 1, pg 217)

As intimated in the above quote; every nation that has ever been, or ever will be, has had a Law to govern its people and its society. This is also true of those nations in the Millennium (note especially the Law of Tabernacles in Zech 14:16-19). As stated by Moses himself by the Spirit (Dt 4:5-8) and echoed by Paul (Rom 7:7-14), there never has been, or ever will be, a more perfect National Law than that established by God at Mt. Sinai. This is even extended to the before mentioned Jubilee system embracing the financial affairs of the nation, which one author ("Jubilee on Wall Street") showed would have basically driven poverty out of the nation. And, even this very law Paul said was "spiritual" in the reference above, that sets it apart from the Laws of the worldly nations, and elevates it to the Law of the Theocracy. Thus, when the Theocracy is restored (under Moses and Elijah and Y'shua himself at the end of the trib), could a greater law be found than this one which shall, then, be "written on the hearts" of every citizen of the Kingdom?

"The welfare of the whole community was assumed as the great end in view. This is true, for the lowest as well as the highest, the poorest as well as the richest, was protected in his rights, and oppression, tyranny, etc was impossible (Dt 16:18-20 etc) under its constitution. But it was far



more than a mere "step" in the right direction - it was the form of government, given with broad outlines, which God - who knows best - regards as most desirable for man, indicated (1) by its first establishment, and (2) by its final reestablishment. To have God directly for a Ruler, is both an unspeakable honor and inestimable blessing." (Vol 1, pg 219)

Note that in the author's words, he specifically states that the form of government established by God (who is "the same, yesterday, today and forever," and "who changes not") through the Mosaic Covenant, will again be established at the end of the trib and beginning of the Mill. Without realizing it, he has proven that the Mosaic Covenant has not been abolished (as he claims - Vol 1, pg 327). Thus, the restoration of this government demands the restoration of the covenant itself, that forms and regulates the same, under, once again, the benevolent rule of the Great I AM, which the author shows, even in particulars.

"The blessings annexed to the Theocracy are numerous, and precisely such (e.g. Lev 26, Dt 20, 30 etc) as a people here on the earth earnestly desire to attain. They culminate in the expression (Lev 26:12): "I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people," which is again reiterated (Rev 21:3) at the restoration of the Theocracy." (Vol 1, pg 220)

These blessings show the superiority of this Law to that of any other nation, and they were originally given by the Mosaic Covenant, and the restoration of the same (and those of the Abrahamic and Davidic) prove the restoration of the Mosaic Economy as well. This is even seen in the blessings of Moses to the tribes being drawn from, and eternally tied to, that of the blessings of Jacob over the tribes (Gen 49, Dt 33).

David Hill (27 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (8)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

### **NECESSITY:**

"In turning back to the fountain head from whence this doctrine, this faith in a Messianic Kingdom proceeds, we only reiterate what others have most aptly stated when we invite for the covenants an absorbing interest in view of their living fundamental connection with final salvation in Christ's Kingdom...Indeed, it is universally admitted, however explained afterward, that the covenants are the proper basis of future Revelation, and that they contain in epitomized form the substance of God's purpose in reference to man's salvation, the Messiah's Kingdom and Glory, and the perfected Redemption from the curse. Hence, men of all shades of opinion agreeing in this matter, it is essential for anyone who desires to become a real student of God's word to make himself familiar with these covenants, seeing, that, in the nature of the case, all things following must correspond fully with these previously given pledges and guides. While the covenants are necessarily primary in a proper conception of the Divine Plan relating to Redemption, presenting a central idea, the reader will observe that they are Scripturally based and grammatically founded on direct oath-bound promises." (Vol 1, pg 285)

It need not be understated that the blessings of all the covenants will come to us through Y'shua Messiah who submitted Himself to the Spiritual Law of the Mosaic Covenant so as to righteously "fulfill" them and thus legally purchase our salvation. More on this will be said in the section (13) on the New Covenant, but one should deeply ponder this; that our salvation is intimately (not typically - as he proves Vol 1, pg 290-5) tied eternally to the Mosaic Covenant. In fact, the very title Messiah is proof of this for it means anointed and, "the very title implies faith and hope in the Fulfillment of the covenants" (Vol 1, pg 385), which anointing (of Kings and Priests) is a direct result of the Mosaic covenant, and not the Abrahamic or Davidic (see also Vol 2, Pgs 556-7 etc).

The ordinance of the Lord's supper alone proves this, drawn, as it is, from the Passover Supper (1 Cor 5:7); as does the reception of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2 - Jer 31) which occurred on Pentecost - The Feast of Weeks (Lev 23) - both of which are a result of the Exodus and the Mosaic Covenant and not the other two. These Holy Days for the Church, together, prove the perpetuity - forever - of the Mosaic System regardless of any changes that may, eventually, occur in the Sacrificial system itself ("I will drink this anew with you in the Kingdom").

"Approaching the covenants and seeing how they form great central points around which revelations cluster - yea, the foundation stones upon which the Christological structure is erected - we are not surprised at the efforts made to undermine their force, either by separating the Old from the New, as antiquated, or by elevating the New far above the Old as only worthy of reception, or by a rejection of the Old as not authentic, etc." (Vol 1, pg 286)

The author does not realize that, in so far as he undermines the Mosaic Covenant, he also undermines the entire Old Testament and its covenants including the New Covenant.

"God is jealous of His Covenanted Word, and after having confirmed it by oath, by the sending of His Son, etc., He presents it in a form, through additional revelation, admirably adapted to test the faith of His people. Much of it, the most precious portion of it, the distinctive features of it, still belong to the future and are dependent upon the Sec. Advent of Jesus the Messiah." (Vol 1, pg 338)

The fact that there are contained in the Mosaic Covenant, prophecies that are yet unfulfilled (The Restoration Dt 32, The blessings of the tribes Dt 33, The prophet like Moses to be fulfilled perfectly by Y'shua at the reinauguration Dt 18 etc - Vol 3, pg 28, 426 etc), requires a restoration of the Mosaic economy to do so (as with the unfulfilled prophecies of the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants), which is specifically stated throughout the Word (The Covenant Dan 11, The Temple Ez 40, The Priesthood Mal 3 etc). The author's unfortunate rejection of this feature is addressed by himself in reference to those who reject the other two covenants.

"One reason why so many Messianic predictions in the Old Test., especially in the Psalms, are explained away as relating to David, Solomon, Hezekiah, etc., arises from the fact that the prophecies do not agree with the writer's preconceived notions of the covenants and of a

spiritual kingdom. The covenanted foundation of the predictions is overlooked or perverted, and, of course, the superstructure is correspondingly untenable. Thus valuable Scripture is given up to unbelief. Even pious and able writers, who recognize such passages as Messianic, under the influence of the idea formed of the covenants and Kingdom, will call the very words given (as they admit) by God very "one sided"...because they seem to them too earthly or too Jewish, forgetting that the Theocracy proclaimed pertains both to this earth and to the Jewish Nation." (Vol 1, pg 340)

This is exactly the case with Peters' treatment of the restoration of the sacrificial system during the Mill as recorded in the closing chapters of Ezekiel. Because of his view of Christ's atoning sacrifice, he renders these sacrifices irrelevant, spiritualizes them to the Church, then works back to the Mosaic Covenant and deems it null and void. A proper view, however, of these sacrifices (taking the prophecy literally as he admonishes in several of his propositions - 4, 48 etc) will rectify any perceived contradictions or difficulties and restore the Mosaic Covenant back to its original, vital, position in the Covenant chain.

"The knowledge of the future is an essential element to a correct apprehension of the Plan of Salvation. The Covenants themselves, in their most precious aspects, relate to the future, and now for any additional information respecting them, we are dependent upon that class of men to whom God by His Spirit vouchsafed a knowledge of the future...for it is a communication from God, a prehistoric record of Divine purpose, and if properly linked together forms a continuous chain of evidence, evincing the unity of the Divine Plan in establishing the Kingdom. To perceive this unity, so confirmatory to faith, a knowledge of the future is indispensably necessary; hence it is graciously given, that we may, beholding the future as present, see the unfolding of covenanted grace, realize the evidences of a prevailing sovereignty of the Most High, and have excited in us faith, childlike trust, hope, and love." (Vol 1, pg 340)

David Hill (27 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (9)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

### **CONDITIONALITY:**

"Its provisionary and initiatory character has already been noticed, while its conditional nature is evident from the blessings and curses pronounced by Moses in Lev. and Deut...While it was the bond under which the Kingdom of God, as an earnest, was bestowed, it embraced many things which were only temporary and provisionary." (Vol 1, pg 311)

The rejection (Doctrinally) of the Mosaic Covenant is based upon a misunderstanding of the provision of the Levitical sacrifices, which they must spiritualize away. But, to authorize this process they must, in turn, prove that the Mos. Cov. itself was only temporary and thus done away with. The only way that they can do this is to over-emphasize the conditional nature of the Mosaic Covenant.

A casual reading through his section devoted to the Mos. Cov. will prove this, for, if the Mos. Cov. was inferior and to be done away with, this is the section where Scriptural proof should have been set forth. In the mere two observations under this section, no Scriptural proof is given to this belief except one reference to Hebrews which the author does not develop. Thus, his whole argument on this point is summed up in the quote above. This alone should cause one to ponder the correctness of this view which is held by most, if not all, in the Church. This, more so, coming from a writer of Peters' caliber, from a work that is exhaustive, and considered by experts to be the classic of the premill faith. This error can be easily refuted by noting that the restoration of the blessings of the Mosaic Covenant in the Kingdom prove that the covenant has not been done away with.

"Nearly everyone, in this connection, point out two things: (1) That a return to God with full allegiance to Him in the Theocratic Order, would secure a return of God's blessing (thus showing God's purpose to be a continuous one), and (2) That upon such a return at some period, indefinitely stated, in the future, this Theocratic Rule - a special distinguishing privilege - is invariably connected with the nation, where God chose to place it." (Vol 1, pg 225)

And note that the "Theocratic Rule" is the Mosaic Covenant. Secondly, the fact that the Jews, to this day, are still suffering under the curses of the Mosaic covenant prove that it is still in effect. This point, actually, is not refutable. For, if the Mos. Cov. is now null and void, then the Jews would not receive either the blessings or the curses of the same. That the nation is currently suffering under the curses of the Mosaic Covenant Peters himself points out.

"Although the Jews are dispersed, under punishment for unbelief, yet there is something so distinguishing in their national relationship to the Divine Purpose that God, foreseeing all that has occurred in the past, still most graciously declares (Lev 26:44), "Yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them: for I am the LORD their God." Whether they believe it or not, mercy follows them for the sake of the covenant, and mercy will yet verify that covenant in the history of the nation, for "their God" has sworn it." (Vol 1, pg 288)

Note that, "That Covenant" is not the one he made with Abraham, but the one he made with "them" the nation of Israel at Mt. Sinai, which Peters, unknowingly, just stated had been sworn to by God. No further proof is necessary for this point.

"The preservation of the people is distinctly predicted, not in the possession of King, government, etc., characteristic of a nation properly organized but, in a dispersed and utterly disorganized condition, retaining national peculiarities, such as rites, practices, customs, doctrines, etc...dispersed among powerful nations, they continue to exist, while these nations disappear. Denied the privilege of living under their own magistrates, etc., debarred for centuries from all civil rights; suffering frequently the most terrible persecutions that ever afflicted a people; driven from country to country and made a "hissing," "by-word," etc., among nations not wise, but cruel; in brief, enduring, as history shows, what no other nation on earth has ever

passed through, yet they still remain a peculiar, distinctive people...the same nation which experienced this heavy tribulation is also, to realize the blessings of restoration. There is nothing so sad and absurd in the interpretation of the Bible as that, alas! so prevalent with many, to give all the threatenings, curses, and afflictions to the Jews, and appropriate the promises and blessings to the Gentiles, or to the Church. It is not only wrong but dishonoring to the Word, and opens a wide field of arbitrary exposition. The threatenings and reverses have been literally fulfilled, even to the minutest particular, so also must the predicted blessings, standing as they do in the same connection with this scattered, etc., people." (Vol 2, pgs 56-7)

The fact that the Gentile world and Church have unanimously labeled the wandering Jew cursed of God, is an incredible and powerful statement to the fact that the Mos. Cov. is still in force for the nation; that the conditionality relates to the blessings and curses and not to the covenant itself; and that this conditionality was designed by God to keep the Jews a distinct people wherever they wandered, and in so doing, provided for Himself a permanent witness in the world to His own existence, which was the major reason for forming them into a nation in the first place. Thus, faithful or not the intended purpose of the Mosaic Covenant is fulfilled in the nation perpetually.

David Hill (27 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (10)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

### **S U S P E N S I O N :**

"So that, in the very nature of the case, the Mosaic Covenant being also a legitimate, but yet inferior, resultant of the previous covenant, it must itself, when the original covenant is to be fulfilled, give place to its superior." (Vol 1, pg 312)

We have previously shown that the Mos. Cov., as the Ab. and Dav., is a perpetual oath-bound covenant that initiated the Theocracy. Thus, in these particulars, the Mosaic Covenant is equal to the latter two. So, we must understand how Peters equates this covenant as being "inferior" to these others, or that it will "give place" to its superior (which statement is unsupported by Scripture, being pure inference).

"God's purpose to establish a Theocratic Kingdom will not fail because of its being conditionally set up at Mt. Sinai; that if the Jews rebel against their King and He gives them up to punishment, yet His promise to Abraham - which we see here already takes the form of an outward, external, real Theocratic Kingdom - will ultimately be carried into successful accomplishment." (Vol 1, pg 312)

The only inferiority presented by the author is that this Mos. Cov. is not currently being fulfilled and thus implies that it never will be, but that the Ab. and Dav. will be fulfilled in the Kingdom. This argument can be overturned by two points; that neither the Ab. or Dav. covenants are

currently being fulfilled EITHER, and that non-fulfillment is no proof of dis-annulment of a covenant (his own proof - Vol 1, pg 303 etc).

"The fact of his [Abraham's] not inheriting is plainly stated in the Scriptures, and that we are directed to the future, to the resurrection period, for its fulfillment...to say that all this was fulfilled in the occupation of Palestine by the preparatory or initiatory possession of it by the descendants of Abraham, is not only contradicted by Scripture, but is a virtual limiting of the promise. Kurtz...observes, what History attests, that the descendants never possessed the land promised to Abraham from the Nile to the Euphrates...It is only by a perversion of facts that a fulfillment can be made out, although it is attempted under the reigns of David and Solomon." (Vol 1, pgs 297-8)

Here we note that the Ab. Cov. is not currently being fulfilled, nor was it fulfilled in the time of Abraham, and it was not fulfilled under the Mosaic Economy (which is his point for the inferiority of the Mosaic Covenant), nor was it fulfilled under the Davidic Economy. This, by his reasoning, implies the inferiority of the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants and their dis-annulment similarly to his view of the Mosaic. Taken altogether, however, it shows us that they will all be fulfilled in God's time - not that one is inferior to the other, for they all failed by unbelief, which failure required the advent of One who would not fail and thus would fulfill all the covenants.

It would be well to point out that the arguments in the New Testament concerning the Mosaic Covenant and the Church's relation to the same, were designed to show that the Church was not subject to the ordinances and not to prove that it had been "abrogated" (to abolish by authoritative action). To try and prove the latter design, using the arguments from the former is to take liberties with the Word that he (and all others) doesn't have the Scriptural Authority to do, as he himself admits (Vol 1, pg 634) stating that there was no "direct verbal abrogation of the Mosaic institutions" which is conclusive, for, if the Mos. Cov. was confirmed forever by the oath of God Himself, then it would require (Gal 3:15) a direct command from God Himself to abolish it, which the author states elsewhere as "the most precise and determinate instructions should be presented, affirming the same. Now the lack of these is evidence of the correctness of our position." (Vol 1, pg 230), in reference to the abrogation of the Ab. Cov. that some teach.

Since this command was never given, then it is folly to suggest that the Mosaic Covenant has been repealed or abolished, just as it would be of the Abrahamic or Davidic or even of the New. Thus, as far as Israel goes (Judah), they are "estranged" from God (Ez 14:5, Jer 19:4), and all three covenants are held in suspension or abeyance, as the allotted curses run their course. But none of the covenants have been voided, nor can they ever be.

David Hill (27 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (11)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

**TRANSFERAL :**

"The Kingdom of God is expressly covenanted to the seed of Abraham (but to the faithful obedient seed); now how can the covenanted promises respecting the Kingdom in this line be carried out into realization when the nation embracing that seed is rejected?...Can the nation or people who are to specially receive what the Jewish nation then lost by its non-repentance, obtain it without any reference to the Abrahamic And Davidic Covenants, i.e. without, in some way, becoming, by adoption, or engrafting, or incorporation, the seed of Abraham? Remember that God confirmed his promises by oath, and that He is faithful - not given to variableness or change - and, therefore, unless these questions can be satisfactorily and consistently answered, so that the promise still runs in the covenanted Abrahamic line, there would be a sad and unwarranted deficiency somewhere." (Vol 1, pg 387)

There is one last, great link in the Theocratic Chain that must be understood and so I include it in this series and that is the Transferral of the Kingdom (Mt 21:43) to "Another Nation."

Since the offer of the restoration of the Kingdom in the person of Y'shua was rejected by the southern nation of Judah (1 K 11:11-13, 29-37; 13:16-24), the need remained to transfer it to this other northern nation of Ephraim (Ez 23; 35:10; 37:22; Zech 11:7; Mt 21:28; Lk 22:38; John 10:16 etc), that would "bring forth the fruits thereof" which is an obvious reference to the preaching of the Gospel and harvesting souls for the Kingdom during this current Church Stewardship (dispensation if you prefer). This then kept the Election intact and engrafted Gentile believers, not into the Jewish Nation (Judah), but into the Northern Nation of Ephraim (Vol 2, pg 64 for his teaching on the Ten Lost tribes, which he never quite connected to this other nation).

This adoption of Gentiles was provided for in all three covenants, specifically as the "stranger" that gave up all to be part of this covenanted nation - Ruth the classic example. Before we get to the proof on this, it must be pointed out, that before Judah can, as a Nation (Zech 12, Jer 31 etc) receive this New Covenant, with its resultant restoration of the Theocracy, the Kingdom must be transferred back to them, as I have stated in previous posts (see Hos 4:6 etc).

This is clearly seen in Y'shua's application of Is 8:14 to himself (Lk 7:23 "offended" should read "stumble over"), and by the Apostles (1 Pet 2:28, Rom 9:32).

The significance is that "both houses [nations] of Israel" shall stumble over this stone. Now, Judah stumbled over him at the first advent, so when did Ephraim stumble over him (as a nation)?

Keep in mind that Y'air Davidy ("The Israelite Origins of Western Peoples") proved that the Magi that honored him at his birth, and the King of Parthia (same nation as the Magi), who acknowledged him as the rightful King of Israel (an ancient source says the King sent a letter to Y'shua telling him that if the Jews wouldn't have him, then to come on over and set up shop in Parthia) were actually a large portion of the Ten Lost Tribes who the Assyrians had placed between themselves and the Persians in a "buffer zone" (their *modus operandi*), and that over time these people gained control and rose to power (who else among the Gentiles would thus honor a Jewish King?).

Thus, at no time in the past has Ephraim as a nation stumbled over him as their rightful King (Vol 2 pg 91). In fact, Peter states just the opposite (1 Pet 2:6-10); that the nation was again "the people of God."

It would do well to ponder James' words in Acts 15:16 where "after this" is referring, in context, to this preaching of the New Covenant by Ephraim to the Gentiles. Keep in mind that James was now the Crown Prince of this Theocratic Kingdom, from an earthly standpoint.

It is extremely ominous that he quotes from the prophet to the Northern Nation (Amos 9:11) and from a passage that details the judgment on them because of this rejection at the Pretrib Rapture (vs 9:8-10).

Here I need to add that, since Ephraim went into exile in 740 BC, the Mosaic Covenant was suspended in their lives, i.e., as "wanderers among the nations" they were "divorced" from the same till the time that they received the New Covenant Nationally. Because of their divorce, they received neither the Blessings or the Curses from the Mos. Cov. which resulted in them losing their National identity as well, and this is how God chose, in His sublime wisdom, to keep this nation hidden in the world while maintaining their bloodline (as opposed to Judah who have received both blessings and curses at various times and have always maintained their identity because of this).

Thus, when they received the New Covenant (Hos 1:10, and 1 Pet 2:10), they continued under it solely until such a time as (1) They enter their promised land (2 Sam 7:10 - which is not the land of Israel because they were already settled there; this is their second land grant that they are entitled to as firstborn; notice Hos 6:1-2 two of the Lord's Days is 2,000 yrs thus 1776 was "the third day" from their original exile), and (2) They reconfirm the Mosaic Covenant, Nationally, in some way (which many believe was fulfilled in this "Christian" "In God We Trust" "Nation").

This, however, would not be the restoration of the Theocracy proper, but the restoration of Ephraim as "The Northern Nation" as a Nation in their own land (just as they existed after the break away from Judah 1 K 13), in preparation (Vol 1, pg 587) for the re-establishment of the Theocracy, with revived Priesthood and House of David in the Land of Israel.

"Thus e.g. consider what Jesus said to the Jews (Mt 23:37-39; Lk 13:34-35), respecting his leaving their house desolate until a certain period elapsed...and until the predicted time (as e.g. Zech 12:9-14; Joel 3 etc), of their repentance and willingness to receive the Messiah. This "house" receives singular treatment at the hands of those who overlook the postponement of the Kingdom. Forgetting how this word is used in the Davidic Covenant and by the prophets, we have a variety of significations given, which are not in accordance with the covenants, or the prophets, or the facts as they existed when Jesus spoke...history shows that the Temple (as indicated by Mark 13:1,2 etc), by the additions made by Herod, was a splendid edifice, while the City and Land were far from being desolate. The same history, however, informs us what was desolate and remained desolate, viz.: the Davidic Kingdom which was overthrown, - the Davidic



Tabernacle which was fallen down, - for the Jewish Nation, instead of having their former covenanted Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, were under the rulership of the Roman Emperors. This corresponds precisely with what David himself predicted, Ps 89:38-45. Let the careful student but reflect: If Jesus came to fulfill the prophets, he will use the word "house" as they employed it, and especially as it was given in the covenant. This he did, taking the word to denote the fallen Davidic House or Kingdom, which was indeed "desolate" for a long time, and, being left by him in that state, continues so to the present day." (Vol 1, pg 628)

Now the need for this continuity in the covenant chain, other than being enforced by the precedent established in ordination ceremonies under the Mosaic Economy, and the fact that Peters didn't quite hit the Bullseye on this (Vol 1, pg 409 where he makes the Church this other nation), is pertinently seen in a comparison of two of his propositions (61 and 62) where the Kingdom "is now" (present tense) given to this other Nation and then he says in the next proposition that this people "becomes the elect nation" (future tense). To some this may be a minor technicality, but one must remember one other minor technicality and that is that now our salvation is hanging in the balance (instead of on "nails fastened by the Masters of the Assemblies which are given by one Shepherd" - Ec 12:10) on these points. The Kingdom can not be given to a nation that does not yet exist, nor can, subsequently, that non-existent nation bring forth any fruits.

This harvesting the author does not specifically address, as it has been fulfilled by the Apostles and Church ("the first fruits of Asia" etc). This point alone destroys his view (prop 65) that the Kingdom is given to them (the Church) at "the gathering of the elect" at the Second Advent, for the fruits were already being gathered, and thus, the other nation, as a nation, must have already been in existence in 30 AD and received the New Covenant. I remind you that, technically, the twelve Apostles were all from north Israel (for a reason) excepting Judas, and were commissioned to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" which includes the northern nation (thus typifying the 144,000 in the trib). He tries to sidestep this issue (prop 65 obs 9), but unsuccessfully; which itself supports the need for this continuity in the Covenant Chain that this great scholar of the Word intuitively felt was missing from his own chain; for, though God may "call the things that are naught as if they were" the Divine continuity has always existed in its realization in real time in the world of men - necessarily so. Thus, this link from Judah to Ephraim with the subsequent harvesting of the Gentiles, is established and maintained through the New Covenant itself, while the other three covenants are held "in abeyance."

That it is maintained on a national basis can be proven, conclusively, by the process of engrafting, which Paul, drawing from our Saviour's own typology (Acts 9:5 where "pricks" are grafted branches), expounds in Romans 9-11.

"This Kingdom of God is given, not to nations, but to one nation. This is distinctly stated, "a nation" Mt 21:43. It necessarily follows from our Scriptural propositions, and corroborates them. It is a logical sequence from the premises laid down. For, so long as one nation is chosen from among all others, and the Kingdom is covenanted by oath to that Nation, it is impossible for

other nations, in their national capacity to be thus elected. It would be a violating of the most solemnly given promises and assurances." (Vol 1 pg 392)

The author breaks the force of his own statement above by, subsequently, rendering this "nation" that thus receives "the Kingdom" into "a people" (The Church) at the gathering at the end of the trib, which leaves them with no national capacity at the time of the transferral.

"The Kingdom is promised to the natural believing descendants of Abraham, and as the nation, then existing when the Kingdom was offered [emphasis mine], refused to repent in order to receive it, God must now - to carry out His purpose - raise up a nation unto Abraham, i.e. a nation in some way still related to him...the importance, therefore, of tracing His chosen nation [the Church], and ascertaining how it becomes - to insure covenanted relationship - incorporated with the elect nation, the Abrahamic people, can not be overestimated. Upon this largely depends our estimation of the covenants, the faithfulness of God, the continued election of the Jewish Nation [the remnant Rom 11:5], the design of the Church, the nature of the Kingdom, and the Inspiration and Unity of the Word." (Vol 1, pg 392)

So, the question now is, how can God engraft the believing Gentiles branches into the place where the non-believing Jewish branches were cut off if that nation was rejected, and with it, presumably, the covenants of promise? Peters tries to answer this question by saying that "the root" that they are engrafted into was the covenants themselves and their "personal interest" in them (Vol 1 pg 397), but his answer is placed in doubt by his own words.

"Both elect are the seed, the children of Abraham; both sets of branches are on the same stock, on the same root, on the same Olive Tree; both constitute the same Israel of God, the members of the same body, fellow citizens of the same commonwealth...forming the same "peculiar people," "Holy Nation," and "Royal Priesthood." (Vol 1 pg 404)

Thus, it is obvious that the root is not referring to a covenant but to a person (Judah and/or Ephraim) in a National capacity at the time of the reception of the New Covenant which is, really, the only reason for the Lord to chose out twelve Apostles.

That the root is a person or a group thereof, and not the covenants themselves, can be gained from the context of the passage in three particulars. Firstly (vs 16) the root is compared with "the firstfruits" which, obviously, as used elsewhere in Scripture (Rom 8:23, 16:5, 1 Cor 15:20-23, 16:15, Jam 1:18, Rev 14:4), is referring to a group of people, which is further clarified by the "lump" being Holy, which is a reference to bread, which also is symbolic of people (Lev 23:17 compare with 1 Sam 10:4, Lev 24:5, Mt 13:33 etc) and it would be the leaven (symbolic of doctrine - good or bad - Mt 16:12) which would symbolize the covenants, and not the firstfruits.

Secondly, these Gentile branches had been cut off of a "Wild Olive Tree", which is referring to Gentile nations, none of which have a covenanted relationship with God, thus, the root would not be referring to a covenant but to the origins of the nation.

And finally, the branches that are cut off are still "beloved for the fathers' sake" not for the covenants sake. The root, then, of the Olive Tree is referring to the Patriarchs (Heb 11) and not specifically the covenants with them. The fathers are the root that is rooted in the covenants (Ps 80:9) and a further study of the use of this symbol in Scripture will be conclusive (Is 11:10, 14:10, Ez 31:7, Hos 9:16, Mal 4:1, Mt 13:6, Rom 15:12, Rev 5:5, 22:16 etc).

The fact that the Patriarchs became "an Holy Nation" shows us that, taken with the entire context in Rom 11, the root is, in fact, the commonwealth of Israel and further that, in order for the Gentiles to be grafted into this root, this nation, this commonwealth, when the southern nation was cut off, this other nation already in the covenanted line must have been a nation at that time (via descendancy from Abraham and reception of Y'shua as their national Messiah), in order to transfer the Kingdom to them, from Judah, exactly as it will be when transferred back to Judah as prophesied (Vol 1 pg 600). Therefore, this nation is not the Church but can only be the nation of Ephraim.

That this is assuredly the case can be proven also from the "parable" of the Barren Woman and the Married Wife (Is 54), of which Peters says, "Surely, if ever fancy or imagination has had full play in exegesis, it has been on this Scripture." (Vol 2 pg 130)

However, his own attempt only confuses the passage and the women involved, as a comparison with Gal 4:26-27 proves. For, Paul makes the Jerusalem above the Barren Woman, and the earthly Jerusalem the Married Wife (under the Mosaic economy). Peters feels this inconsistency in his own view (just the opposite of Paul's) by saying that Paul "looked in faith" to the Married Wife and his inheritance, and further by emphasizing the interpretation by the "general analogy" as opposed by the immediate context. Both are necessary, and the correct understanding of the immediate context should then be understood as to how it relates to the broader general analogy of Scripture.

The confusion is simply due to the lack of understanding that these two women are two nations - Ephraim and Judah (Ez 23 proves this). Judah was never divorced (Jer 3 and Is 49 where the question about the bill of divorcement is to emphasize the fact that Judah was never given one - Vol 2 pg 133), but Ephraim was divorced (Jer 3 - the two sisters again, vs 8 specifies Ephraim's divorce, see also Hos 1:9-10, 2:2 etc). Thus, the northern nation of Ephraim is this Barren Woman (which Peters shows is a reference to a people whose land has been laid desolate as was Ephraim's by the Assyrians prior to the time of Isaiah's writing), who is to bring forth more children than the Married Wife (could not this be a specific reference by our Lord to "the other nation" and this very passage?), or the southern nation of Judah.

This, in context, is referring to the preaching of the Gospel of the New Covenant and thus "Bringing forth the fruit thereof." The chapter previous (53) is, of course, the Theocratic Sacrifice of Y'shua, then this Barren Women becomes remarried here in chapter 54 under the New Everlasting Covenant (vs 13 compare Jer 31:34 and 3:12-14 and Ez 16:60), which is described in the very next chapter (55) as "the sure mercies of David." The children (fruits) here referred to, would thus be the "Children" of Gal 4 or the engrafted Gentiles under this New Covenant. But

Judah also will receive this everlasting covenant (Jer 30-33, Ez 16) and also Ephraim will be brought back under "the rod" of the Mosaic Covenant (Ez 20:33-38 probably specifically those of the nation that relocate to the promised land as I don't think the nation of Ephraim in its entirety will), I would guess, as a result of their rejection of Y'shua Messiah in some way ("My Lord delays his return"?), and thereby stumbling over him. This will then, subsequently, require the stumbling stone to be taken out of the way (Is 57 by putting it back in its proper place as the cornerstone) of both Judah and Ephraim during the trib (note the stranger of chapter 56 is the Male Child of Rev 12 and the Leader here in 55:4; and the eunuchs of chapter 56 are the 144,000 - these two will be instrumental in this work, especially helping Ephraim recognize his true ancestry), which is described in the next chapters (58-59) and into the Millennium (60). Not only does this view clear up any contradictions between Peters and Paul, but it brings a unity to this section of Isaiah, which should lead to a greater understanding of the book as a whole.

Both of these women are further symbolized by the story in 1 K 13, where only the wisdom of Solomon could tell them apart. The first woman was lying. Her child (type of Y'shua) was born, then three (of the Lord's) days later the other (male child of the apocalypse) was born ("the crown of the head of him that was separated from his brethren" Gen 49:26).

Then, the first woman "smothered" her child (crucifixion leads to asphyxiation), but craftily left him in her own bed and then accused the other woman (who represents Ephraim - notice both these women are called harlots as both nations committed adultery against God by worshiping idols), of killing her own child ("The same judgment you judge other with you are guilty of yourself"), and switching them.

Subsequently, the kid was just about torn in two (Ez 37) and threatened with the Sword of Judgment (Dan 11:22, Ps 116 etc).

And, I will add, that these same two women are assuredly the two women of Zech 5 that take a third woman back to Babylon to "build it a house on its own base" (Rev 17-18), which preview was just seen on the sixth day of the sixth month (Sept 3rd) of this year and their "war on terrorism" when, for the first time in 2500 years, Babylon made the International News.

And, that leads to the obvious conclusion that these three women are also the three sisters of Ez 16 (where the Return of Sodom is symbolical of the endtimes return of Babylon - Vol 2 pg 82). This is strengthened by the judgments of Edom (where Sodom was) and Babylon (Jer 49:17-21, 50:40-46) using the exact word-for-word typology (poor of the flock, noise of the fall etc) and comparing both to Sodom (49:18, 50:40).

All of this, now, can be further supported by the transferral of "the keys" of the Kingdom to Peter. When taken together: "I will give the Kingdom to another nation" and "It is the Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom" and "I give to thee the Keys of the Kingdom" shows that an actual transferral of Kingdom Authority occurred, and thus "The Kingdom" was transferred from the Nation of Judah to the Nation of Ephraim via Peter, the Apostles and the New Covenant.

I feel the need to state here that in the transferral back to Judah, in preparation for the restoration of the Theocracy, and the re-unification of the two nations (Ez 37), that God ordains the 144,000 who are responsible for the salvation of "The Great Multitude." For any of them that might read this; in reference to conversions (Rev 12:17, 14:13 etc) and a public demonstration of the same, due to the nature of the case, I would assume that any Christians left behind (and there will be plenty in America and Europe) would need to be re-baptized under your authority (1 Pet 3:21), having been cut off from the body ("true vine" John 15:6) of Messiah. They, and actually yourselves and any Gentiles saved during the trib, are no longer part (specifically) of the Bride, but are now "children of the Bride chamber" (or as I like to call it, Children of the Kingdom), as far as I can tell. If any reject, and since Paul compared our baptism with Y'shua to that of the Israelites to Moses (1Cor 10:1-12), remind them that 40 yrs later the people were baptized unto Joshua when they crossed the Jordan and entered the promised land (Josh 3).

As far as communion; you will still be offering it to any new converts, but for left-behind Christians, I really don't think any of us can make a change to that ordinance without Y'shua's direct command. The problem may occur that some might (in their conscience) consider that they are re-crucifying Messiah. A possible modification may be to use water (John 19:34 and compare other verses that combine "bread and water" in the Word - there are more than you might think). But, perhaps, the best would be for them to abstain from "the fruit of the vine" until they can drink it "anew" in the Kingdom with Y'shua (which some have stated may be a reference to the vow of a Nazarite - Num 6).

The transferral of the Kingdom to Ephraim specifically for the purpose of "bringing forth the fruit thereof" is the whole purpose for the two parables of the two sons (Mt 21:28 and Lk 15:11). In Matthew, a certain man (God the Father) had two sons (present tense - Ephraim and Judah), he asked "the first" (Ephraim the firstborn - Jer 31:9 and note the significance of this birthrite being recorded in the passage of the New Covenant as well as in this parable) to work in the vineyard and ("bring forth the fruits thereof") he said no (Assyrian Exile), but then repented (First Advent). The second son (Judah) said, "I go" (First Advent), but then didn't (Roman Exile).

Note that this shows the transferral from Judah to Ephraim, and the second parable notes the transferral, because of the sin of Ephraim, back to Judah, when the Kingdom will be restored ("all that I have is yours" - Judah's vs 31). Again, notice the precision of the Holy Spirit in these two parables for, though Ephraim was the "younger son" who became the prodigal, he was still the firstborn son of the previous parable, with Judah being the second, though older son, who inherits his father's Kingdom. This should indicate to us that with Ephraim/America wasting the inheritance (biggest debtor country in the world), and experiencing a (global depression/war induced) famine (Rev 6:5), then here in America, we can expect this prophecy to soon be realized in the life of this nation. And notice, especially that, he remembered whose son he was at that time.

This view, by the way, and only this view, consistently clears up all of the remaining parables that are still hotly contested.

"To appreciate the parables in all their fullness it is absolutely necessary to keep in view the covenant and the divine purpose in its fulfillment, as shown in previous propositions...the parables having reference to the Kingdom of God must, as is the case, have reference to the rejection of Jesus and the consequences resulting therefrom, otherwise they would not be adapted to meet the exigencies of Christ's position...The change from the direct form of teaching to the parabolic which excited the astonishment (Mark 13:10) of the disciples is readily accounted for in view of this contemplated postponement, especially when it is considered that the parabolic form was introduced (so numerous Harmonies) after the representative men of the nation had commenced consulting and conspiring against Jesus. Because of the moral obliquity (Mt 13:13) evidenced by the nation, He now teaches in parables in order that they may remain in it (Mk 4:12), and carry out their plans to the end...the direct appeal being rejected, repentance being refused by the nation, the postponement of the Kingdom and the processes in preparation for its ultimate re-establishment demand the veiling of the parabolic." (Vol 1 pgs 16,21)

Not all of these parables directly apply to the Church Age (The Sower - Mt13, Mk 4, Lk 8; The Wheat and Tares - Mt 13:24; The Wicked Servant - Mt 18:21; The First and Last - Mt 20:1; The Tower - Lk 14:28; The Dutiful Servants - Lk 17:7; The True Vine - John 15:1 etc), but some to the Rejection (The Vineyard - Mt 21:33, Mk 12:1, Lk 20:9); the Rapture (The Humble Guest - Lk 14:7, The Sheepfold - John 10:1); and the Harvest (The Tribulation: The Net - Mt 13:47 which is basically the same symbolism as The Snare that springs shut at the Pretrib Rapture - Lk 21:35; The Woman in Travail - John 16:21; The Dry Tree - Lk 23:31) and even into the Millennium itself. Thus, Y'shua does not reiterate, in another parable, the same stages but further reveals the progress of the Kingdom from the postponement to its restoration. There is a consistency in interpreting these parables, founded in the first ones given (Mk 4:13) that should be maintained throughout.

THE TREASURE (Ex 19:5, Ps 135:4) hid in the field ("the field is the world") is Ephraim as a "wanderer among the nations" of the world for the last 2700 years.

THE PEARL of great price, as a product of the Sea (a type of the Gentile nations - Dan 7 etc), is the Gentile Christians grafted into Ephraim which is why the Lord linked these two parables together. Judah would be "the Jewel" in Scripture (Ez 16:12, Mal 3:17 etc) which probably includes the Antediluvian Patriarchs (Heb 11), and wasn't included here because of their rejection of the first offer. Notice that neither Judah, the Church or the Pearl was "hidden" only Ephraim - The Treasure was (compare Is 49:2 where the Lord is Y'shua and thus the arrow is someone else, and other passages that contain "hidden" things).

These assuredly correspond with THE THREE MEASURES OF MEAL that the woman (Holy Spirit - The Wisdom of Proverbs) hides the leaven (Doctrine of the Kingdom - The Covenants), which emphasizes the individuality between the Israelite, Church and Trib Saints, but also that, they are, after all, really the same.

The Parable of THE BLADE, GRASS AND EAR showing the growth of this diverse community from start to finish (emphasizing the climax at the end of the age and harvest) in its consistency

and unity (and may even entail a reference to the three previous covenants themselves, for aught we know).

The Restoration of the Kingdom is described by the Parable of THE MUSTARD SEED (where a seed can be the symbol of a person - John 12:24) which "a man took" (Rapture - exact same word), and sowed (The Sower is the Lord - Mk 13:37) "in his garden" (Land of Israel) and it grew to be a shady tree (Ps 1, Jer 17) for the Fowls of the air (Good angels and Glorified Saints - Mt 13:4,9 compare Mt 24:28 etc and see Vol 2 pg 618 noting especially John 1:51 which is still future for its greatest fulfillment and see my posts on angels in achieves). For the mature, take note that the mustard seed is "THE LEAST of all seeds" sown, and compare other verses with this same phrase (Zech 4:10, Jer 49:20, 50:45, Am 9:9, Mt 11:11, 25:40 etc). Notice there is no mention of the sower "taking" the good seed at the start of the Church Age, as opposed to this "least" seed. That this is not referring to the Church Age can further be seen in the fact that, contrary to popular misinterpretation, the mustard seed is a very fast growing plant and sprouts leaves in 24 hours. This is indicative of the speed of the restoration of the Theocracy during the trib. I remind you that mustard is used to induce vomiting (Rev 3:16).

This, then, clears up the Parable of THE DRESSER of this same "garden" or "vineyard" ("The Least in the Kingdom" Mt 11:11) who persuades his Lord (Y'shua) to hold off cutting down THE NEW FIG TREE (the third year of the trib after confirming the Mosaic Covenant at the start of the trib - Lev 19:23-24, Mt 24:32 where "generations" should read "age") until it has been fertilized into the fourth year (of the trib when the Antichrist breaks "The Holy Covenant" Dan 9:27). This individual, then, is THE PORTER Mk 13:34 who watches for the Lord and opens the door for him; the Doorkeeper of the Psalms which means, literally, "to snatch away"; as well as possibly THE GOOD SERVANT of Lk 12:39; and THE FAITHFUL SERVANT made ruler over the Household in Lk 12:42 see next section for more on this aspect).

And, is not the ministry of the 144,000 to the left-behind Christians portrayed by the Parable of THE PERSISTENT FRIEND (Lk 11:5 where "children" are again engrafted Gentiles and New Converts of Lk 18:16 etc - The Children of the Kingdom), as well as in the third sending of the servants in the Parable of the supper (Lk 14:17) after the second group was already gathered into the wedding hall (vs 22 at the Pretrib Rapture - i.e. first group was the disciples to Israel with the second group being the Apostles to the World and thus this third group can only be the 144,000 to the World during the trib).

And here we have a marked contrast from THE GREAT SUPPER and THE MARRIAGE FEAST of Mt 22:1, which indicates the two stages of the Return (as a close study of the context of Luke will confirm - emphasizing both a "supper" and a "feast" twice each), as well as the sequence of events for both houses of Israel. However, this can only be seen by a very close comparison between the two, as a running synopsis. The clue to unraveling these is the two phrases "poor, maimed, lame and blind" which is REPEATED (Lk 14:13 and 21) for a specific reason, and "come, for all things are now ready" (Mt 22:4 and Lk 14:17).

These are two separate accounts (Luke's takes place at a dinner in a Pharisee's house and Matthew's after the triumphal entry has occurred), showing that he gave two separate and distinct Parables, giving us two different aspects of the return. You have the Marriage Feast at the end of the Tribulation, and the Great Supper at the beginning of the trib. And here is the breakdown (necessary, especially now, as this Parable is, perhaps, the most important one in the precise time we are at and because this account in Matt. is the passage that contains the transferral of the Kingdom which is the Key to the Kingdom, if you will, without which the Bible is left in the obscurity of the parabolic.

In Luke's account a certain man makes a Great Supper and sends his servants to bid his guests saying "Behold all things are now ready." They made excuses and would not come. The servants returned to the Lord and told him and he was angry. This was the first offer of the Kingdom to Judah (by the 12 and the 70 in the Gospels) which they rejected, resulting in the postponement of the Kingdom (or the supper if you will). This is synonymous with the first sending of the servants in Matthew's account (22:1). So then, (in Luke), he sends the servants the second time into the streets and lanes to get "the poor, maim, lame and blind" which they do, proclaiming the second time "all things are now ready," and gather them in (Pretrib Rapture), but there was still room. This is the offer of the Kingdom (or supper) to Ephraim and the Gentiles during this Church Age. However, in Matthew's account there is now a significant change in the result of the second sending of the servants and that is that they made excuses and some even killed some of the servants (one of the Doves just posted on this very subject), which caused the King to send out his Armies (plural - Hos 13) and destroyed the murders and their city. This is referring to Ephraim and not Judah, which is proven by the fact that there is no postponement this time, but the king specifically re-iterates that at that time (of this destruction) "the wedding is ready" and he then sends out the third set of servants into "the highways" (both accounts) to compel them in, which is the 144,000 during the trib (after some had already been gathered in). Luke's account very accurately records the postponement of the Kingdom and the transferral of the Kingdom from Judah to Ephraim and Matthew's account records the loss of the Kingdom by Ephraim and its return to Judah. This is further proven by the context of Matthew. He tells us about the two sons showing Judah's non-repentance, which resulted in the vineyard parable and the death of the Son (and their destruction by their own words) then the transferral of the Kingdom is stated along with the Stumbling Stone (to both houses of Israel) which reminded Y'shua that in the future Ephraim also would stumble over him, prompting this Parable of the Supper, which shows the rejection by Judah and the rejection by Ephraim which results in their judgment. The judgment of Judah is not repeated in this Parable because he just go done describing it in the vineyard Parable.

This is a very precise and detailed description of our Lord and it further supports all I have said in this section and, for those who do not generalize the precise Word of God, but take every word as inspired, then there is no other way to reconcile the differences in those two feast Parables then what I have set forth here. The Holy Spirit will bear witness to those who "have ears to hear." However, this view will only be strengthened as we proceed.



The attitude of THE PRODIGAL (America) and THE RICH BARN BUILDER (Lk 12:16) with the ground that brought forth "plentifully" (the breadbasket of the world - I hear that interest rates are at an all time low for those who are interested in refinancing their barns). It is terribly ominous that the owner of the barns was planning on tearing his old barns down so he could build a new one, which explains the judgment on that "night" ("The Morning Comes" the Rapture, "but also the Night" the trib). They will feel the edge on that one.

THE STORM CLOUD that rises in the West (Lk 12:54 probably began to rise around Nisan of this year - note the south wind that brings the judgment in the summer/fall/hurricane season - i.e. West of Israel is Europe and this is probably a veiled reference to the revival of the Roman Empire in the near future by the people who run this world described as "They" in Daniel's Vision of the Four Beasts and these are the ones who are planning the New World Order out of Chaos and thus equate to the Rich Barn Builder above), is very probably this judgment on Ephraim at the start of the trib - "judgment begins at the house of the Lord" - Church at Rapture, Ephraim at the very start of the Trib, Judah at the halfway point and the Gentiles at the end), and this transferral back to Judah.

The ONE LOST SHEEP is assuredly a reference to Ephraim as the leader of the "lost sheep" of the house of Israel (Lk 15:4), confirmed immediately by the Parable of THE TEN LOST COINS (the ten northern tribes under Ephraim), just before the Parable of the Prodigal which further emphasizes this conclusion.

These ten tribes, many of them which get left behind, are also clearly seen in THE TEN VIRGINS (Mt 25:1), who are no longer part of the Bride, but would be considered friends of the Bride and, therefore, children of the Bride chamber. According to the ancient custom (see post in achieves The Wedding Procession) these virgins would wait for the Groom and Bride to "return from the wedding" (THE WAITING SERVANTS - Lk 12:35) that took place at the Bride's parent's house. These children of the Bride chamber would be waiting near the Groom's new house, at which point they would enter in and have a Marriage Supper (there had already occurred a Feast at the Bride's Parents house). Many confuse the oil with the Holy Spirit, however, a Lamp is a type of the spirit of a man (Prov 20:20). Now, the wise virgins took extra oil with them in a separate vessel, as well as the oil already in their lamps. The unwise only took the amount of oil that they thought would be enough. The attitude of complacent believers who only do enough "good works" ("Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your father which is in heaven" - Mt 5:16), to earn the name "Christian" or in this case, "A child of the Kingdom" or "Friend of the Groom." By their attitude they show that they are really not believers. The wise, however, continue to produce good works continually, regardless of circumstances, because they love the Groom. However, this indicates that the Ten Lost Tribes themselves may be left out of the Kingdom Proper (like some from Judah - Mt 8:11 etc), if they are not totally committed to the Lord, which is the purpose for the Parable of THE WAR (Lk 14:31), indicative of this very 'wedding' procession, from Sinai to Armageddon.

It was Judah who, in the Parable of THE SHREWED SERVANT, after rejecting Y'shua, got kicked out of his position of authority (Lk 16:1) and sought "everlasting habitations" among the nations

that they had previously traded with in imports and exports. And they are also seen in the Parable of THE RICH MAN (Lk 16:19) with poor Lazarus typifying the Remnant of Judah (1 Cor 16:3). This remnant itself is pictured in the Parable of THE PERSISTENT WIDOW (Lk 18:1) which represents a city (Jerusalem) that is destroyed by foreign invasion (Lam 1:1). It may also represent widowed America shortly after the Trib. Perhaps the immediate context might yield more insight for those interested.

"A Christian cannot thus object, because God, who is all-wise and merciful, undoubtedly selects the best methods by which (in the briefest time, consistent with man's moral freedom and His own Purposes), to attain to the ultimate Redemption of the world with the least loss and with the greatest honor to His moral government. Hence we, unable to grasp the innumerable details and principles underlying a Divine Plan only partially unfolded, should not set ourselves up as judges and arbiters of the matter, but simply receive the mode indicated by the Word itself." (Vol 1 pg 410)

And when we follow Mr. Peters advice, and lay aside our preconceived Theological blinders, and search the Scriptures in faith, waiting for the Illumination of the same by the Holy Spirit, then most, if not all, questions will be more than wonderfully answered.

Look at one last parable with me (Lk 19:11). A Nobleman (Y'shua) went into a far country (Israel at the reorganization at the start of the trib - Rev 4-5, Dan 7:13 when the Ancient of days "came" - as seen from Ephraim's perspective at "the ends of the Earth" where Y'shua knew they would wander to) to receive a Kingdom and commanded THE TEN SERVANTS (The Ten Lost Tribes via the 144,000) to occupy. Notice there is no death of the Nobleman and/or his son, only that "his citizens" hated him, and said we will not have this man rule over us. After he received the Kingdom and returned (end of trib) he commanded the servants be called (gathering of the elect by the angels at the end of the trib Mt 24:31), they are rewarded and then his enemies slain. Now notice the other differences between this parable and the other one in Mt 25:14.

One is given before he entered Jerusalem (which, like Zacheus and his friends represent the ten lost tribes who also are "the children of Abraham" Is 63:16, and any Gentile converts), and the other to the disciples on the Olivet discourse (representing the remnant of Judah - notice no specific number of servants as the other account). This latter represents the preaching during the Church Age when Ephraim was still lost and the former, after the Pretrib Rapture, when Ephraim's identity (America and other Anglo-Saxons countries and other small groups scattered to the four winds) is manifested (as Joseph was to his brothers during the Seven Bad Years). Also note the "long time" of Matthew's (The 2,000 yr long Church Age) is lacking from Luke's account, and nothing of the citizens (remnant of Judah) hating him and not wanting him to rule over them (when they receive him as Messiah at end of trib). The reference to the reception of the Kingdom is lacking from Matthew's account because he does not receive the Kingdom during the Church Age (as Peters proves) but only during the trib (Rev 4-5).

The reason for the second one (in Luke) was not as a witness against the rejecting nation, but because his disciples thought that the Kingdom was to "immediately appear" so he showed

them when they could expect the Kingdom - after the Ten Lost Tribes had been identified in the end days (see also Lk 17:12).

Thus is the incredible detail and accuracy in the Word of the Holy Spirit. For Matt was to the Jewish Nation and Luke to the Northern Nation. Notice also that the first servant in Matthew only doubled his talent but the one in Luke multiplied his pound by tenfold. The pound is only about 1/6th of a talent and this shows the foundational work of the Apostles as compared with the 144,000 (compared to the wall of the city where the gates in the wall are made of Pearl - Gentile engraftees). This indicates the success of the Gospel preaching of the 144,000 assuredly harvesting the results of the shock of the Pretrib Rapture on a sleeping world caught unawares.

The previous

servants are rewarded as rulers over many things, the latter over cities (assuredly in the countries they ministered in). This is the Apostles ruling over the 12 Tribes at the Rapture (rewarded - proven by "enter into the joy of your Lord" - reception of Glorified bodies), and not to the 144,000 (who are possibly still mortals at the end of the trib - Rev 14). Thus compare Lk 17:10 (Church Age Saints at Rapture) and Luke 12:37 (Trib Saints at Return) "after the wedding." One group he reckoned with (directly at Rapture) and the other group in Luke's passage he called to have brought before him at the end of the trib (gathering by the angels of the elect).

This last Parable leads me to believe that judgment upon America will occur, not when we turn our backs on Israel per sae, but when we stumble over the Scandalon and publicly and politically and religiously as a nation reject God as our "King" or "Messiah" which God being Y'shua bar Y'hova (How is the Ten Commandments thing coming along?). Thus, when we say, "we will not have this man rule over us" then the transferral back to Judah will occur and judgment will fall on Ephraim (see 1 Pet 4:17) at the Rapture and start of the Birth pains or "The Beginnings of Sorrows."

Editor's Notes : April 14, 2008 : I originally decided that the Crowning of Moon Messiah in Washington a couple of years ago was this rejection and it may have been however, that event was actually staged by the Insiders for my benefit because of that very statement I made above. The proof that they staged the event is that this should have resulted in a forty year probation period for Ephraim as with Judah at their rejection of Messiah which would then put the beginning of judgment against Ephraim as occurring in 2044 AD which is well past the end as I have shown in my section on the Chronology. In fact, Ephraim's judgment should begin, at the latest, in 2033 AD and thus, forty years previous places us at 1993 AD which, actually, resulted in the death of the Branch Davidians and, perhaps, this is the same as rejecting Messiah, to some extent but requires further study.

David Hill (29 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (12)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

**RESTORATION :**

I have already provided quotes from the author and Scripture references to show that, when the nation is resurrected (Ez 37 - see post The Valley of Dry Bones), then so also will the Mosaic Covenant, and then the blessings of all three covenants will be realized by the inheritors during the Millennium and beyond (see his comments Vol 2 pg 117 which apply to this restoration of the Mos. Cov.). However, I would like to illustrate this further to set the stage for this section.

To this day I remember a discussion I had with an Amish friend in the Military, when we were talking about the Law, and he stated, "The Law was nailed to the Cross" in reference to Paul's words in Col 2:14. Well, I might ask, "What was nailed to the Cross?" and the answer is, obviously, Y'shua. Thus, Y'shua is the Law. So, for those who say that the Mos. Cov. is a permanently dead letter, I would ask this, "What happened to the Law three days later?" and, the answer is that it was resurrected. Thus, these three days became three of the Lord's days ("a thousand years in your sight is but one day"), and thus, on "the third day" (an incredible study in itself) the Law will be resurrected in the life of the nation ("Life from the dead" - Rom 11).

Why was Abraham heartbroken for three days (Gen 22:4)? Because the Heavenly Father of Many Nations was heartbroken for three days (Is 48:16-19).

Why was Isaac silent for those same three days? Because there was no Laughter in Israel for three days (John 16:21).

Why was Joseph justified on the third day (Gen 40:18)? Because the Dreamweaver Counted on that third day (Mt 27:62-66).

Why did Moses journey three days into the Barren Wilderness (Ex 3:18)? Because the Living Waters (John 4) were Drawn Out for three days (John 19:34).

Why did Joshua enter the promised land on the third day (Jos 1:11)? Because the Savior entered the Heavenly Land on the third day (John 20:17).

Why did Samson pose his riddle for three days (Jud 14:14)? Because the Shining One (Mt 17:2) had everyone puzzled for three days (Lk 24:21).

Why did they look for Elijah for three days (2 K 2:17)? Because they looked for Their God Yah for three days (John 7:33, 13:33).

Why was Jonah fasting and praying for three days? Because the Doves were mourning for three days (John 16:20)\*.

Why was Ephraim raised up on the third day (Hos 6:2)? Because the Grain (John 12:24) was Fruitful on the third day.

Why was Saul blind for three days (Acts 9:9)? Because there was no Answer in Israel for three days (Mk 15:3-5, Acts 8:32, Is 53:7).

Why was David at Ezel for three days (1 Sam 20:19)? Because the Beloved had Departed for three days (Lk 9:31 "decease" = "Exodus").

So, why will Judah be restored on the third day (Ezra 10:6-9)? Because the Celebration was restored on the third day (John 16:22 see also Dt 33:7).

To my Jewish brethren I would ask, in reference to the last verse above by Moses: When was Judah ever separated from his people? For, even in exile and captivity he has always played a prominent, Kingly role in the life of the nation (like Daniel in Babylon). Thus, history testifies to the fact that the verse must be read Messianically as, "Hear, Y'hava, the voice of Judah and return him to his people." For those Jews who say (Vol 1 pg 378) that there is no "clear, unequivocal prophecy" from the Old Testament concerning the Second Advent of Messiah - here it is.

This application of the three days can be applied to the Resurrection itself (note Y'shua's reference to this same verse in John 10:18 - who do you think pointed out that interpretation to me?) and, as all the rest above, a second application can be made to the Return itself after three of the Lord's days for, Y'shua was (and is) The Son of God. Note also that this prophecy was not recorded in Jacob's blessing of the tribes, but comes to us from the Mosaic Economy, obviously, for a reason, I might add.

\* On an extremely personal three-day-note (which I hesitate to include) : On the previous three days from "The third day of the third Jewish month in the year of our Lord 2,001" there were no terrorist attacks in Israel. This was during the height of the intifada, when there had been attacks every day. Yet for three solid days there were none (enough to make special notice of it over the radio). "How can the birds be singing on a day like this?" Christians would say that anyone who would blow themselves up to kill someone else is, obviously, suffering from Demonic Possession or Oppression. The Demons are typified by the Fowls of the Air in the Word (Mt 13:4,19 note especially Is 18:6). So, why were there no Birds "singing" in Israel for three days? Because the wrath of the Lamb was rekindled in those three days.

All of this is as powerful a statement as can be made (humanly speaking) to the Jews that Y'shua is the Son of God - following as it will upon the resurrection of those Jews and Christians believers who have accepted the New Covenant during those three days, and will go along way to prepare the nation itself, as a nation, to receive that same New Covenant (Zech 12 etc). Thus, I challenge them to find a more Scriptural description of all the covenants, including the New, as laid out in this series of posts and as it has been manifested in the history of their nation and that of Ephraim. The time is coming, very soon, when one will come unto you saying, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, again, and this time, it ain't gonna be postponed!" (compare the Holy One Y'shua at the first offer of the New Covenant, and The Watcher Prince David of the second offer of the New Covenant in Dan 4 where Neba's seven

insane years are a type of the Church Age and were held in abeyance to be fulfilled in the seven year tribulation or Time of Jacob's Trouble).

Then all eyes are going to be on you, and what you do with this man (Hos 2:16) Y'shua. On that day, when you "look upon me who you have pierced" and God then carves the Law on your heart, Paul says that it will be life from the dead (Rom 11, Ez 37). This is The Day that he also describes as all creation groaning until the Sons of God are revealed, and Peter as hastening unto The Day. I am here to tell you: that day is now. "Behold, now is the accepted time, now is Yom Y'shua" (Is 49, 2 Cor 6, Ps 95).

"Scott remarks that it denotes the restoration of a thing to the state from which it had fallen, and that it must include the Sec. Coming and the restoration of Israel. Dr. Bell says: "The word translated 'restitution' might be rendered 'restoration'"...But what is to be restored, brought back to its former condition with increased glory? Gerok quotes Baumgarten as saying, "Nothing else than the Kingdom of Israel, the whole power and glory of the Israelite Kingdom." While Gerok justly observes that it includes more, as the prophets predicted, yet Baumgarten is right in laying stress on the restoration of the Theocratic Kingdom; for that is the burden of prophecy, that is the main, leading object to which the eye of faith and hope is directed." (Vol 2 pgs 465-6)

The first thing that we need to realize is that the descriptions of this Restoration in Ezekiel 40-48 are referring to a mortal Prince and people and Priesthood (not Glorified Saints), who live through the tribulation (Vol 3 pg 87).

"The Prince is a mortal man; for to him are ascribed "sons" to whom he may give gifts etc (ch 45:16 18), and he is exhorted not to do wrong...This Prince being thus mortal and un-glorified, is subject to sinfulness, for he is exhorted to offer "a sin offering" in behalf of "himself" as well as for all the people, which cannot be applied to Christ...The Theocratic rule here delineated is very different from that exhibited under Christ and His associated body of Rulers...The only answer that might be given is this: That this Prince is a mortal, ruling over the Jewish nation at its future restoration under - subject to - the Reign of Christ."

I hesitate to state the obvious because some, in the past, have misunderstood my viewpoint, or misinterpreted the Scriptures on this subject. However, because of its importance in this very subject of the Restoration, with Peters I conclude that, "Consideration urged that, as God proclaimed it, and frequently adverted to it, duty and faithfulness demanded its insertion as a testimony and warning to others." (Vol 2 pg 102)

It is obvious, as Peters stated, that this Prince cannot be Y'shua, and just as obviously, and for the exact same reasons, he cannot be King David himself (as Pentecost says in "Things to Come"), for in that day King David will be in a resurrected and glorified body as a citizen of the New Jerusalem (Heb 11:32, 12:1), and will not, at that time, sin or have offspring. The obvious reason why some propose this is because this individual is specifically mentioned by name in the Word.

Jeremiah records his name (30:9 - note the significance of his name being mentioned in the New Covenant passage and compare with Is 55:3 and see my post Theoferrum - "Let him who reads the letter execute the message"), and that God would raise him up. This is not referring to a resurrection, for God raised up Moses for the nation of Israel at the Exodus (Am 2:11), and Judges (Jud 2:16) and King David himself (2 Sam 23:1) and Y'shua at the First Advent (Lk 1:69).

Ezekiel (34:23-24, 37:24-25) also calls him by name and states that, as a shepherd he would feed God's flock under a "covenant of peace" and calls him a Prince. This is further detailed in Chapter 37, which is the chapter on this very Restoration of Israel (The Dry Bones and Two Sticks - again see my post Theoferrum for the perfect merging of these two sticks) and gives us a clue to his ancestry, for he will be descended from Judah and specifically from David (per Jer 33:21 - the New Covenant Passage again), on his father's side and from Ephraim on his mother's side (The Male Child of Rev as the 13th star must descend from Ephraim, the 13th tribe in order of birth and from Joseph, for this honor and blessing was given to him in the dream originally, and not to Judah or any other tribe - Gen 37:9). In this way, because both houses can claim him as their Prince, the nation is bonded together again and the enmity between them (Is 11:13) is ended. By the way, note that it is the LORD who is stating this and this is Y'SHUA; there is no other way to interpret these passages, and whoever would do so, inadvertently removes Y'shua's Divine Right to that position of Y'hova in the Word - they try to rob him of His Glory and not me (Job 34:33). [1]

Hosea (3:5) also names him and links it to "the latter days." There are many more passages in both the Old and New Testaments that confirm this teaching and add more details (Hos 1:11, Mic 5:3-6, Hab 3:13 etc), specifically to his position as Prince over reunited Israel, just as all the other mortal nations will have mortal Kings ruling over them, in submission to this Prince of Israel who is himself subject solely to Y'shua.

But note this: Y'shua had seen these prophecies in the Word and knew that they were not referring to himself or King David, therefore he rightfully understood that this person would be Prince over Israel in the end times and Millennium directly under Y'shua's rule, which is the only view that explains some of his statements in the New Testament referring to this individual (Mt 11:11, 17:20 - Zech 4:7, Mt 24:47 where "Household" is the Davidic Throne, Mk 4:31, Lk 6:48, Mt 13:52, Lk 10:22 - 1 John 4:12, Lk 12:43 - Rev 12:5 etc), including one very well known passage (John 5:43) which most (if not all) interpreters apply to the Antichrist, however it is assuredly (keeping the above Scriptures in mind and Y'shua's understanding of them) referring to Prince David (who offers the New Covenant to Judah the second time), and that is the passage that reads, "If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." Y'shua's name, as such, was not connected with these prophecies of this anointed, however, and this is the key, Y'shua saw himself in the prophecies wherever Y'hova is mentioned and thus "I am come in my Abba's name" because Y'shua is Y'hova (John 10:30, 8:58). See especially Zechariah 12:8-10 which completely proves my point, for Y'shua could not have interpreted that Messianic passage any other way then that he was the one whom they would "pierce" and that, therefore, he was Y'hova who was speaking (and in fact, since "no man has seen God at any time" - 1 John 4:12

spoken after the Revelation was received by the way - then every appearance of Y'hova in the Old Testament must be that of Y'shua himself, as stated in my post the Son of Man). And this was his Divine Right and legal title to the Theocratic Throne as Y'hova, born from the Loin's of David.

He, then, also knew that this Prince David could not claim any such Divine Right, and in fact, might not be able to prove his lineage from David (because of the coming destruction of Jerusalem and exile which he already knew would last about 2,000 years), or from Ephraim (because they were already lost and would continue as such for those same 2000 years), and thus (Zech 9:6-7) would have to fall back on the three prophets who called him specifically by "his own name" (thus see Mark 9:38-40). I believe that he is also called "a servant of Kings" in Isaiah which is exactly how he appears in Ez 40-48 (and my post Theoferrum) as a servant to Y'shua. Hence, he is commonly called the Prince, as opposed to Y'shua who is the King of Kings.

With all these in mind (that Y'shua is Y'hova in the Old Testament), then we see that the Vice Regency was established by the Mosaic Covenant (which answers Rabbi Bibas' question of "Two Rulers" - Vol 3 pg 88), for the mortal nation at Sinai, when they were so terrified by the presence of Y'shua in His Glory as Y'hova (as were the disciples Mk 9:6), that they requested Moses (a mortal man) to be their Daysman between themselves and God (Ex 20:19, Dt 5:23-33). But note especially that the Lord heard their request and said, "they have well spoken" and laments that they should always thus fear Him. So, the Lord then established the Vice Regency in the Theocracy which eventually became known as the Davidic Throne and Covenant - a mortal shepherd over a mortal nation, directly and solely under the authority of Y'shua bar Y'hova. Thus, the restoration of the Davidic Throne must include this Vice Regency; it can't be otherwise.

When we realize this (and that this was Y'shua and "He changes not"), then this Vice Regency in Ezekiel is a logical (and the only) conclusion to the prophecies, with the New Jerusalem on earth so paired with the Old Jerusalem (God's "footstool") as to be indistinguishable from it (note the plural Thrones in Ps 122:5 and "compact together" means a joining together as in a marriage), as Peters himself says.

"It is impossible to separate the Glorified (The King and Co-Rulers) from the unglorified, for they are united, the one as authoritative head and the other as specially exalted in view of this union (hence numerous prophecies make no distinction between the two, but speak of the nation as it shall be when restored and associated with the glorified seed of Abraham - which gives the Key to the magnificent language employed)...The relationship of the Jewish nation restored (mortal) to the glorified portion, is an inseparable union, and...the supremacy accorded to such a union necessitates that language of the prophets respecting the supremacy of the nation, as it shall be in the future, without discriminating; and...this supremacy (owing to Divine Ordering) pertain(s) to a nation which is described in conditions restricted to a mortal condition, and yet exalted to it in view of the overruling Divine Government instituted in its behalf under the rulership of the Glorified Messiah and his coheirs. Looking at only one side of the subject is doing violence to



the unity of covenant and prophecy, which has two sides, a human and a divine." (Vol 2 pgs 97-100)

Thus his own words above perfectly meets his own objections to the Vice Regency as predicted in Ez 40-48 (below). This splendorous union of the Thrones of King Y'shua and Prince David is wonderfully explained in my posts the Theoferrum Crucibulum, for the mature Christian and Jews to contemplate. And this Vice Regency of Prince David to King Y'shua (Rev 3:21, 12:5 etc), as here presented, is portrayed in the Mountain Kingdom and the Stone Kingdom of Dan 2:34-35, 44-45, where the Mountain Kingdom is Y'shua and the Glorified Saints, forming a Kingdom already in existence at the end of the trib, which Peters makes note of.

"Such passages include the idea, that the authoritative manifestation of Theocratic Rule is exhibited, before it issues forth from the desert. It is a form ready for action before it emerges from the Wilderness. Considering the formation of the Theocracy with its added hosts of Kings and Priests in so isolated a place, secluded from the observation of the nations, and its sudden and overwhelming appearance, it may be a question whether Christ had not this initiatory stage in view when He told the Pharisees, "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation" seeing that it is not only divinely instituted, but this is done in a secluded manner and place, so that when it appears it is already so organized as to be irresistible, etc." (Vol 3 pg 23)

And, in fact, this Mountain, which is emblematic of an existing Kingdom, is literally a reference to "The Throne of Glory" the New Jerusalem itself, when it is established on this earth at the start of the Millennium (Vol 3 pg 39). Thus, the Stone cut out of the Mountain, is the restoration of the Theocracy via the Davidic House and Covenant and its Vice Regency, because, "The change from a Stone to a Mountain is unsuitable to Christ." (Vol 1 pg 683). The restored mortal nation and its Capitol City the Old Jerusalem will be built up during the Millennium (Songs 8:8-14), into a Mountain (Kingdom) because of the Kingdom of Y'shua represented by this very Mountain.

This is why, throughout the Word, there are scattered references to the Lord having two armies (a Heavenly one that returns with Him as in Rev 19 etc, and an earthly one composed of mortals from Ephraim and Judah as in Zech 9:11-16 which is this Stone cut out of the Mountain). The 68th Psalm is a classic example, which Peters (quoting three different sources, one of which is a Jewish Rabbi - Vol 3 pg 20) says could be translated as, "The Horsemen of God are two companies of myriads" and may not Ezekiel 37 describe this earthly army, along with other passages in the Word (the Armies of the King in Matt 22:7 that exact justice on the murders, and notice especially Is 60:22 where a Small One (The Stone) becomes a "Strong Nation" which is exactly the same phrase used in Joel 2:5 as "A Strong Nation set in Battle Array," again a possible further reference to Ez 37). And in the chaos of those events, the ability of Prince David to be able to coordinate the earthy army in tandem with Y'shua and His Heavenly Army, would be of the utmost importance for the nation itself. This ability to communicate with the Lord is amply illustrated in my post Theoferrum.

The author rejects this Vice Regency solely because Christ is not "introduced" in the passages in Ezekiel which he should be if this is the Millennial Reign of Messiah (not-with-standing his additional arguments that have already been more than amply addressed - Vol 2 pg 207). However, Mr. Peters failed to realize that Y'shua is introduced (chap 43) for the Lord here is Y'shua, visiting the mortals from the New Jerusalem (see my post Mt. Zion). He then goes on to say, therefore, that this promise to Prince David in Ezekiel is simply conditional and because the Jews didn't repent (?) when they came back from Babylon, that the prophecy will never be fulfilled (even after stating that the Temple will be rebuilt "with a magnificence (see Is 60 etc) superior to the former" which he derived from Hag 2:9 - Vol 2 pg 496), which he then subsequently contradicts by stating that it will be fulfilled by the Church offering Spiritual Sacrifices (along with a whole host of other Millennial predictions that also are not conditional - Is 2:3, 60:1-22, 61:6, Jer 30:17-22, 33:18-21, Zech 14:16-21 which positively show the restoration of the Mos. Cov.) all of which he then lumps under the very technical and professional (please give me some authority) term "Hypocatastasis" (Vol 3 pg 89), which is nothing more than the Spiritualization (Hypercomatosis?) method of interpretation that he demolishes in Vol 1.

The conditionality of these passages is refuted by the same rebuttals presented respecting the same in the Mosaic Covenant, and we have removed the motivation and authority for making them conditional (for Y'shua is the main personage of the passages that the Prince and People are waiting for - chap 44). The reason the Scriptures could not be more specific was so that the Nation could be put in the most favorable position for repentance at the First Advent (Vol 1 pg 364) which would not have been possible if Ezekiel had described the Mill Glory of the Messiah, as such, here.

"The entire tenor of the prediction in its relation to the Prince, the Priests, the Sacrificers, etc., makes a decided impression that it describes a continuation of the Mosaic Ritual, not retrospectively or commemoratively but prospectively in the form instituted under Moses and retained by David (e.g. Ez 45:17-25)." (Vol 3 pg 87)

Here, it is clear from his own Literal Interpretation, that the Mosaic Covenant is restored during the (tribulation and) Millennium, including the animal sacrifices (though with some very interesting and prophetic changes...), which is the real reason that authors try to explain away these passages. For, we know from Barnabas (writer of Hebrews - see the Son of Consolation in the Biography Section) that it was never possible for the blood of animals to cleanse our spirits from sin, so they fail to see (now that the Sacrifice that can do so has been offered) why God would allow them to be restored which they consider a personal affront to God. However, they are not looking at this from God's perspective (through the Eternal Spirit - Heb 9:14), for this sacrifice in God's Eyes was "slain from the foundation of the World" (1 Pet 1:20). Thus, this sacrifice was the first sacrifice slain, and these people should actually be asking themselves, why did God allow animal sacrifices in the first place.

Part of the reason was as a "schoolmaster" to bring us (mortal men) to Messiah, which will still be true of those mortals born during the tribulation and Millennium. As some Theologians say,

they were "prospective" looking forward (in our view) to the Cross, so, as some say, these are retrospective, looking back to his sacrifice, which is assuredly another part of the equation. Another part that all miss is that, when these sacrifices are restored, it is to supply the needs of the Priesthood, the Levites who have no inheritance in the land and must, therefore, derive their sustenance from the people of the nation. Also, they don't just go kill the animals and burn them up, but the Priests and People partook (1 Cor 9:13) of the Altar (how many cows does Burger King 'sacrifice' every day?). As long as the Levitical Priesthood lasts, then, to some extent, so too will the Tithes and Offerings and (temporarily) these Sacrifices.

The reason for their (temporary) cessation was because it would have been impossible for the Gentile Christians, in their totality, to make pilgrimage to Jerusalem three times a year to offer these sacrifices, along with the nation itself; thus, the logical conclusion and authoritative ordinance by the Apostles (Mt 16:19, Acts 15), that the Gentile believers did not have to fulfill the Levitical requirements. So, since Y'shua knew this, as well as the coming destruction of the Temple complex anyways (Dan 9), he made provision for this lack, which we call the Lord's supper, drawn from His Passover Sacrifice. It is also true that these same Gentile believers are predicted to receive their glorified bodies before this restoration, so that there will be no need, in this (near) future sinless condition to ever fulfill the Levitical ordinances. The Church, then, are the inheritors of the Kingdom, which is not the same as the mortals who are the subjects of the Kingdom ("flesh and blood can not inherit the Kingdom" - mortals). Thus, Peters quotes, "Tyng (He will come, pg 159) correctly observes: 'It is a very false representation of Scripture which pictures the Church as subjects of the Coming Kingdom. They shall indeed acknowledge a submission to their Lord, but toward the inhabitants of the earth they will assert a majesty. For this they will have been qualified by their glorification, and to this they have even now been assigned by prophecy and promise.'" (Vol 2 pg 574)

Thus, for the Church the Mos. Cov. has been set aside, but to the mortals of the nation during the tribulation and into the Millennium there will still be a need for this law of the schoolmaster to bring them to maturity in Messiah before their own glorification ( thus, mortals are servants to the Law and immortals are Sons of the Law - Gal 4:1-2 etc, and note the verse that says of this mortal nation that they will be circumcised in the flesh and in the spirit at that time Dt 30 etc).

Now, the need for provision in the Lord's Supper can be understood by Peter's word concerning how Baptism saves us, "not by putting away the sins of the flesh but by the answer of a clear conscience before God." Even though Y'shua's blood has cleansed our spirits from sin, the need for continual "foot washing" of the conscience in this (still) fallen world remains; the guilt (a product of the conscience - Watchman Nee "The Spiritual Man") still remains. The Key to understanding the ordinances of the animal sacrifices and the Lord's Passover is found here. This gives us something we can do to clear our consciences after Y'shua's blood has cleansed our spirits (implied in Heb 9:13 where "flesh" includes the mind or conscience - W. Nee). This then frees us for fellowship with him and each other as a community, and this will always be the case for mortals living in a fallen world, including during the Millennium. If a person understands this penitent sacrificial system, then there remains no problem with the reinstitution of them as is

predicted in the Word. And, actually, this is the only logical explanation of why God allowed them in the first place. [2]

David Hill (29 Sep 2003) "The Theocratic Covenant (13)"

Being a critique of George Peters' Book The Theocratic Kingdom

## **FOUNDATION :**

In his work Mr. Peters states that the New Covenant is nothing more than the renewed Abrahamic Covenant which the Church currently lives under (which, apparently, is a prominent view in many Premillennial circles and may be, perhaps, an attempt to bolster their belief that the Church is the "Other Nation"). I will address this belief below but would start by asking; since the Abrahamic Covenant is an unconditional covenant (Vol 1 pg 176 and see also Chafer's excellent discussion on this point in his Systematic Theology), of what need is there for it to be renewed? This was never addressed by the author, and is really where he should have started that particular proposition.

His whole argument actually hinges upon his treatment of the word New as it appears in Jer 31 and in the passages in the New Testament. He correctly points out (Vol 1 pg 323) that the word often means renewed (new creature, new heavens and earth, new moon etc) and then he goes on to say, "As the phrase 'New Covenant' only appears once in the Old Test. and but a few times in the New, the general analogy of Scripture must be allowed to determine the sense in which it is used." Thus, the renewed Abrahamic Covenant, instead of a totally New Covenant. However, this violates the first rule of Hermeneutics and that is how it is used in the immediate context (which is why he made the above statement - and note his admission of the same; when speaking of the regeneration he says, "so that, let the word be applicable to both (and thus employed), yet the meaning that Jesus attached to it must be sought in the general complexion of the passage." Vol 2 pg 476).

In the "general complexion" of the passage, the Lord is contrasting the nature of the Old Cov. with that of the New. The former was carved on stone and the latter will be on their hearts. Here, it is obvious that we have an entirely New Covenant. This is emphasized by the author's application of "The Letter" (2 Cor 3:6) to the Abrahamic Covenant though, in context, it is obviously referring to the Mosaic Covenant, and thus he inadvertently shows the similarity in the nature of the Ab. and Mos. covenants as opposed to that of the New (Vol 1 pg 332 and note a similar mix up in obs 3 note point (e)).

This is revealed further by the animal sacrifices that ratified both the Ab. and Mos. Covenants (Gen 15:9 and Ex 24:8), while the New is confirmed by the sacrifice of the Eternal Son (Is 53, Heb 10 etc). Along these lines he says that the Mosaic Covenant made no provision for the inheritance because it "provided no resurrecting power" (Vol 1 pg 322), but this is circular reasoning in that he is implying that the Abrahamic did provide this resurrection power because he believes the New is the Ab. Cov. renewed. However, there is no provision for the resurrection

in the Ab. Cov. directly, only in type, which type (sacrifice of Isaac) is no stronger than the type of the smiting of the rock (or the serpent on the pole) accomplished by Moses, or even Moses' mysterious burial etc. Y'shua's statement "before Abraham was I AM" proves this point, as the Archetype of both those types.

"Those who advocate that an entire new covenant was given and confirmed by the death of Jesus differ very much as to the nature and meaning of this alleged covenant. A variety of explanations are tendered, but all these, so far as noticed, with but few exceptions, attempt no Scriptural proof. We are simply to receive assertion, without having the New Covenant itself pointed out and its language quoted. If Jesus gave such a covenant, as alleged, it ought, in the very nature of the case (like preceding ones) to be plainly stated; for a covenant is of so special a character that it cannot be taken for granted, or be simply inferred. Now not a single writer of this class has attempted to produce the covenant itself." (Vol 1 pg 326)

I would first point out that the author, and, apparently everyone else, has taken for granted the fact that Y'shua is one with Y'hava and that the New Covenant contained in Jer 30-33 was first spoken by Him. They also "simply inferred" that the New Covenant was the renewed Abrahamic with no supporting "Scriptural proof." Now, the reason no author from "this class" (Covenant/Replacement Theology) produced the New Covenant, is because they consider the Old Test. void, and for similar reasons, no writer from his class (Premillennial) has produced the New Cov. because, apparently, they feel that the Mosaic Covenant is "inferior" and voided and, therefore, the New is simply the renewed Abrahamic Covenant. They are driven to this position because the New Covenant passage in Jeremiah includes the sacrifices of the restored Priesthood (33:18) which they cannot accept, Theologically. This is also why the former do not understand the nature of the New Covenant any more than the latter.

Y'shua did not quote the "alleged" New Covenant simply because it was so well known (and expected) that the mere mention of it was understood by the Apostles, as he says referring to the covenants in general (Vol 1 prop 19, 22, 40, 44 etc). I will "point out" that the New Covenant as "alleged" by Y'shua is contained in Jer 30-33 and in listing its blessings and provisions I will "quote" its language.

"Behold, the days come when I will make a New Covenant with the House of Israel and the House of Judah" (31:31) and right here we see (hind sight being 20/20) a second offering of the New Covenant to Judah and there can only be one New Covenant (this statement was made after I critiqued Mr. Arnold Fruchtenbaum's Theology who basically stated that the Jews will receive a different New Covenant then that accepted by the Gentiles thus building up the wall again - I mailed him a copy of my book "Israel and the Church on the Road to the Kingdom" circa 1996 and he subsequently changed his tune in one of his monthly letters without extending to myself the courtesy of a reply), because Y'shua can not be offered a second time, after Ephraim/Israel and the Gentiles received it during the Church Age (and this, to provoke Judah through jealousy to repentance - Dt 32:21 and Rom 10:19).

"I will put my Law in their hearts" and this is proof positive that this is not the renewed Abrahamic Covenant for there was no provision for this in any of the first three covenants, but only in this, the New Covenant. That this is correct is confirmed by Paul in Rom 2:14-15 where the engrafted Gentiles fulfill the Law because of "The Law written in their hearts." Thus, at least Paul understood Y'shua's reference to the New Covenant as stated in Jeremiah. This alone is conclusive for he was specifically commissioned to carry this New Covenant to the Gentiles (though paired up with Barnabas and John Mark).

This fact is the strongest proof that Christianity is not separate from Biblical Judaism (it actually destroys all replacement and spiritualized theological systems) and against the belief that it was Paul and not Y'shua who founded the Church as some 'theologians' say (Vol 1 pg 429, 435), or that Paul discarded the belief that Y'shua would one day sit on the Davidic Throne over the restored Theocratic Kingdom (Vol 1 pg 437) for this very Kingdom is also confirmed by the same oath that ratified this New Covenant. Peters' rebuttal of these errors was hampered by his own erroneous views of this New Covenant. Had he understood this, he could have properly and conclusively refuted these Heretics (per Justin) who teach a progressive growth in Church Doctrine between Petrine, Johanine and Pauline (Vol 1 pg 510), the last of which, supposedly, exorcised "Jewish Fables" from our Theology (the ancient Premillennial faith of the believing nation, of John, Simeon, Annah, Y'shua, the Apostles, the Seventy, the disciples and the early Church - universally and uncontestedly - for the first three centuries of the same, as the author proves in Vol 1).

This view also helps to combat the belief that the Church is the Kingdom (Vol 1 pg 583) that replaces the Israelite Kingdom, for, the restoration of the Davidic Throne and the Levitical Priesthood is also confirmed by this same oath. And even that the Kingdom is "in your heart" (Vol 1 pg 586) or that the Apostles had a carnal/incorrect view of the Kingdom (Vol 1 pg 598) for, the Church has received no more blessings than are specifically stated in this Legal Document confirmed by the Solemn Oath of the Eternal Creator, predicted to be given to Israel and not, per sae, to the Gentiles. It is only because of their fall (Rom 11) that it was extended as "a light" to the Gentiles (Is 42:6, 49:6). The view that Israel, as a nation, has been entirely cast off and will not receive any of the blessings or promises (Vol 1 pg 588) is also sharply rebuked when we understand that the New Covenant as given in Jer 31 specifically to this Nation and specifically when this Southern Nation of Judah receives it (Rom 11 etc).

Even the view that the Church is supposed to usher in the Kingdom or to "Christianize the present world" (Vol 1 pg 589) is condemned as untrue by this understanding for the rebellious nations that persecute this nation the Lord will "make a full end of" while He preserves Judah and Ephraim. Many more errors than I present here (that the Church is just a continuation of the Jewish Synagogue - Vol 1 pg 604, or that Y'shua failed in his plans - Vol 1 pg 623) are assuredly swept away when we realize that Y'shua Bar Y'hava has always planned on giving the New Covenant to Ephraim, the Gentiles and Judah in their proper order and in His own time in preparation for the Theocratic Kingdom - the presence of God - to be re-established on this earth as it was before the Fall (Ps 68:18) As I live says Y'hava the whole earth will be full of the Glory of the Lord.

"They shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me" is also expounded by Paul in reference to the Gentile Church in 1 Cor 13 (see also 1 John 2:27, 2 Pet 1:2, John 10:14-17 - this last is assuredly a reference of our Lord to Jer 31).

"I will forgive their iniquity and I will remember their sin no more" is, again, not provided by any other covenant as it is by the New, for Barnabas (please see my recent post "The Son of Consolation" in which I prove that Barnabas is the author of Hebrews) tells us that the "blood of bulls and goats" could not take away sin, and, though Abraham was made righteous by his faith, it would have been impossible without the atoning and propitiating sacrifice (both aspects seen in Is 53) of the Theocratic Covenant (note especially Heb 1 and 7) which Barnabas implies when he says that Levi (Mosaic Covenant) paid tithes in Abraham (Abrahamic Covenant) to this High Priest of the New Covenant, which he "quotes" (Heb 8:9) specifically making Jer 31 the New Covenant. Thus, the second Apostle commissioned to the Gentiles bearing this New Covenant, directly affirms its location in the Biblical record of God's Holy Oath-Bound Eternal Word, in Jer 31 - By two or three witnesses let a matter be established.

Further, it should be stated that, the omission, ultimately, by the Holy Spirit, of any reference directly by the other Apostles (who were strictly commissioned to "the circumcision") is certainly not proof that it is the renewed Abrahamic Covenant, but is itself a very solemn testimony to the fact that the Nation, as such, refused the first offer to them of this same New Covenant in the person of Y'shua himself. And this, strikingly so, emphasizes his words that if you put new wine in old skins they would burst and both be lost. The nation did not repent, and was subsequently burst open by the New Wine that was poured out into the nation at Pentecost, and the Spirit then worked, predominantly, among Ephraim and the Gentiles as it is to this day. It is lack of comprehending this that caused him (Vol 2 pg 51) to answer, unsatisfactorily, the question as to the lack of "The subject of the restoration" of Israel, directly, in the N.T. writers. The simple fact is that, to preach the restoration then, at the time of the reception of the New Covenant by the Gentiles, would have been inconsistent and unnecessary. And, in fact, this also explains why the other Apostles did not mention the New Covenant in Jeremiah *per se*, because of the conditions contained therein of this restoration, when Judah, as a nation, receives the New Covenant. Thus, reference is made to it incidentally as something still future, not as something in effect now.

Thus, in accordance with the other covenants, this one was stated to be "forever" (and "everlasting") and was confirmed by the Solemn Oath of God Himself (Jer 31:35-37, 33:20-26). And if you look carefully through this covenant you will see that the Church has received no more and no less than the promises contained therein. This is the covenant that the Church is living under today. And it is this covenant, through "the death of the testator" that frees the Church from the curses of the Mosaic Covenant (where applicable - see his comments on this death and the curse Vol 1 pg 368).

I might add that Barnabas, who was himself a Priest and knew of what he spoke, stated that Ps 110 and the Melchizedek Priesthood was part of this New Covenant (Eternal and confirmed by oath - vs 4 and which he possibly calls "The Covenant of the Lord" Vol 1 pg 601), that provides us with an Eternal Intercessor, which also is not provided under any of the other three covenants. This, alone, is conclusive. Thus, "no beginning or end" is a perfect description of Y'shua, the Son of Man, as the Melchizedek High Priest existing before David, Moses and Abraham in time and superiority.

This New Covenant was intimated in Dt 30:6 as "God will circumcise thine heart" and at once shows the difference between the Ab. Cov. (which originated this sign of circumcision) and the Mos. Cov. (which continued the sign) from that of the New Covenant which will be a spiritual circumcision not done by the hands of men, but of God (Col 2:11, see also Rom 2 which links this with the New Cov. passage again). Thus, his entire line of reasoning (Vol 1 pg 320), that the renewal of the Ab. Cov., "under which renewal we now live" is forcefully refuted by one "minor" technicality.

The Church, correctly, argues (including the author) that since we are not commanded to fulfill any of the Mosaic Rituals, that we, as a Church, are not subject to the Mosaic Covenant (this rule was originally given in Acts 15 and expanded by Paul in his epistles). I might state, then, that since I am not commanded to be circumcised (Gal 3-5 which the author makes much of to show that the Mos. Cov. has been dis-annulled), and since this commandment was originally given as a sign of the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen 17), therefore I am not subject to the Abrahamic Covenant. This is irrefutable for, if we live under the Ab. Cov. which was confirmed by the Solemn Oath of God, then the Church would be subject to this divine and emphatic commandment. For proof of this read Ex 4:24-26 which occurred before the giving of the Mosaic Covenant (where Moses was almost slain by the Angel for failure to circumcise his son).

"Those who admit the fulfillment of the Abrahamic Covenant in the distant future, but deny that we live under it now (making a new covenant existing), thus ignore its not having been annulled, that our adoption as children of Abraham hinges on it, that Christ's death confirms its validity to us, and that all our blessings flow from it. The dislocation offered by them is unnatural and destroys the unity." (Vol 1 pg 330)

I would make the same (last) statement concerning his view and for various reasons. In reference to Y'shua not annulling the Ab. Cov.; the same requirements he sets forth for establishing the New Covenant are lacking in his presentation of a renewed Ab. Covenant.

Why didn't Y'shua come right out and say, "This is the blood of the renewed Abrahamic Covenant?" Why didn't he quote from the same in the upper room that night?

He proves, from the Scriptures, that the promises of the Ab. Cov. were to "The Seed" Christ. Thus, his view is erroneous and "unnatural" in one particular. We do not receive the New Covenant and its blessings by becoming children of Abraham through adoption; we become the children of Abraham through adoption by receiving the blessings of the New Covenant. There



remains a major difference between the two. We become "brothers and fellow heirs" with Y'shua by adoption (Eph 1:5) upon receiving the New Covenant, and in so doing, because Y'shua is now our brother and is a child of Abraham, we also now, in this relation to Y'shua, are children of Abraham.

To further emphasize this; I feel that I could successfully argue the point (though I don't feel it is needed) in God's Supreme Court of Law itself; with the Old and New Covenants as my Legal Authority; that since I am saved through Y'shua and am now his brother, I could claim, on these grounds alone, not only adoption into the tribe of Judah, from which our Lord, the Messiah, sprang, but into the very Royal Lineage of David and Solomon. Thus, the Church is "A Royal Priesthood."

"The chosen are never called the children of Christ, but his brethren, co-heirs, etc." (Vol 1 pg 329)

Here the author is trying to show that we receive not a New Covenant, but "the promises given to Abraham." However, this is begging the question for Y'shua Messiah will be called "The Everlasting Father" (Is 9:6) and that God the Father would "see his seed" (Is 53:10) and Paul calls him the second Adam or father of the Human race (Rom 5:14), and He Himself calls the saved his sons (Rev 21:7). Thus, this solely emphasizes the elect lineage of Y'shua of necessity, and not the Abrahamic Covenant. In fact, it is because of Y'shua (symbolized in John 12:24) that Abraham's seed is going to be so populous (Gen 22:17), not the other way around.

The author makes much of becoming the seed of Abraham, and rightfully so, and also mentions that we must become grafted into "the commonwealth of Israel" not understanding that it was the Mosaic Covenant that formed Abraham's seed into that commonwealth that was "brought near" at Mt. Sinai (on Pentecost when the Church was also brought near under this Mosaic ritual in Acts 2 showing the intimate connection between Biblical Judaism and Biblical Christianity). Thus, by his own reasoning, the Mos. Cov. is also in effect, and the New is just the renewing of the Old. The fact is, that "The Old Covenant" as referred to by the New Testament writers is referring to all three previous covenants. He himself says that the Ab. and Dav. covenants are "really one covenant" (Vol 1 pg 337), and thus the Mosaic is included in that as the link between the two, which is confirmed by the author himself when he states (Vol 1 pg 230, 232) that provision for these future adopted children of Abraham into the commonwealth of covenanted promises was first made via the Mosaic Covenant and not the Ab. Cov. showing the latter's dependency on the former as the next link in the chain to the Dav. covenant.

Thus, if you state that the Mos. Cov. has been annulled, you sever the connection of the New Covenant back to the Covenant source (as far as the Gentiles are concerned). This, itself can be seen in that, originally, for Abraham to be a blessing "to the nations" it did not necessarily provide for adoption into the Israelite bloodline. The real source for this engrafting, from our perspective, is found in Num 14:21, because these glorified Gentile Saints will be Y'shua's Ambassadors in their respective nations during the Millennium, because the unbelievers in the Israelite nation (taking this Glory for granted) refused to go up into the promised land where

God's Glory would (and will) reside permanently. Ephraim should seriously ponder how this type might be repeated in the life of this nation today.

"By the death of the seed provision is made so that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith - i.e. the promise contained in the Abrahamic covenant." (Vol 1 pg 321)

Here I must emphatically protest his statement that the promise of the Spirit comes to us through the Ab. Cov. (providing no scriptural proof, only sheer inference and a bad one at that), which covenant contains no such promise. Paul (Gal 3:16) qualifies his reference to Abraham as "To Abraham and to his seed" were the promises made, which seed he specifies is Y'shua. Further, there remains the obvious point (in context) that the inheritance of vs 18 is "the blessing of Abraham" in reference to the promised land (Gen 12 etc), and not "The promise of the Spirit" which is more likely drawn from Jer 31 (note this connection by Barnabas in Heb 10:15-16). This promise of the Spirit (Lk 24:49, Acts 1:4, 2:33, Eph 1:13, 1 Thes 4:8) is stated to be from the Father and Peter (Acts 2:34) links it to Y'shua's ascension which is a specific reference to Ps 68 and the New Covenant (and certainly not to the Ab.). The fact that this phrase is not repeated anywhere in the Old Testament directly led Peter to search for it in type (A Gift) and this is the reference he gave to this promise while filled with that same freshly poured Spirit. The point is that the first recorded promise of the Spirit was given by Y'shua himself (Vol 3 pg 65 noting Peter's words in Acts 11:15-17), and the prediction of John (Mt 3:11) is a reference to that of Joel (2:28) stated for the time when Judah receives the New Covenant at the end of the Age. This separate, though "earnest" of the future pouring out of the Spirit needed to be specifically stated by the Lord to authorize the preaching of the New Covenant to the Gentiles while the Kingdom was postponed.

And just here is where the "provocation" lies. Not that the Gentiles also received the Abrahamic Covenant (for any "stranger" could, by applying for membership in the nation), which was already received by the Jews, but that the Gentiles received the promised New Covenant with the indwelling Holy Spirit before the nation of Judah received it (Rom 11:11).

I feel compelled to illustrate this provocation by relating a story I heard while in Jerusalem from a lady who ran a Christian Bookstore there. One day a Rabbi got into a discussion with one of the workers and he became indignant and turned around and stormed out. But at the door he turned and said to her, "We know you Christians have more light than we do, but please leave us the little light that we do have" and then he left. This Rabbi was provoked by this girl because she had received the New Covenant and had the Holy Spirit indwelling her. If the New Covenant is simply the renewed Abrahamic Covenant, then the Church would have no more light than does Israel and there would, therefore, be no provocation.

This can further be emphasized by the loss of the New Covenant privileges in the Nation of Ephraim at their rejection as Priests at the start of the tribulation; for then will be the "famine for hearing the Word of the Lord" (Am 8:11) and "to whom shall He teach knowledge" (Is 28:9) and the people "destroyed for lack of knowledge" (Hos 4:6) and "the prophet is a fool and the

spiritual man is mad" (Hos 9:7) and "The sun will go down over the prophets" (Mic 3:6) and then they will know the loss of light that Judah has experienced for all these years. And this includes those Gentile nations that have had the blessings of the Church in their countries as well. Then, only the 144,000 will be lights in their worlds.

Thus, as a Father gives gifts to his children, and because we have been adopted as brethren of Y'shua by faith (Gal 3:14), God gave us (his children) "The promise of the Spirit." Thus, this promise comes to us through the Seed Y'shua and the New Covenant and not through the Abrahamic, Mosaic or Davidic Covenants.

You can not have the Abrahamic Covenant "in complete force" (Vol 1 pg 320) and yet "It has never yet been so realized as to meet the natural wisdom of man." (Vol 1 pg 335). It either is, or it is not, in operation. If so, then why are we, the Church, not currently living in the promised land? Isn't this a sign of rebellion as it was for the Israelites? The only logical answer is that the Ab. Cov., like the Dav. and the Mos., is held "in abeyance" until the Second Advent. I might add, that as long as the nation, as such, is dispersed from the land, and not fulfilling any of the oath-bound covenants, then the Church as such, engrafted into the commonwealth, can not and will not fulfill any of these covenants either. Only the New has been (currently) given to the Church, and the others only by way of a promise (earnest) of future inheritance, as he points out in numerous places.

The author even goes so far as to say (Vol 1 pg 328) that these covenants will be fulfilled as a result of the incarnation, thus implying via the New Covenant, which, could also be called the Melchizedec Covenant - "A Body have you prepared for me." And all of these covenants are received through faith (Vol 1 pg 334) and not solely the Abrahamic (Heb 11 proves this). Thus, it is a specific new covenant that will fulfill all the covenant promises through the Seed to whom all the covenant promises are given and to whom they all belong and to whom he may graciously bestow them to by faith in his blood, being "slain from the creation of the world" as the Sacrifice of the true "Everlasting Covenant" (Jer 32:40, Heb 13:20 - The New and not the Abrahamic as he states in Vol 1 pg 323), based on the Eternal Nature of the Testator.

This is forcefully proven by the author's own words (Vol 2 pg 375) where he says, "The inheriting of a 'Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world' again favors our position. For, if it refers to a Kingdom designed for them in the beginning, it must correspond with the covenant and the promises based thereon." Now, there is only one such covenant that was ratified "from the foundation of the World" and that is the New Covenant specifically stated by John (Rev 13:8 see also Mt 13:35, 25:34, Lk 11:50, Heb 1:10, 4:3, 9:26, Rev 17:8) which is further emphasized by the fact that this sacrifice - God's Son - existed before said foundation of the World (John 17:24, Eph 1:4, 1 Pet 1:20), and we were in him then, not because of the Ab. Cov. but the New. For, though the Covenant with Abraham was made with the Eternal I AM, the sacrifice that ratified it was not eternal. Only of the New Covenant can it be said, that it procures for us, forever, the forgiveness (Atonement) of sins (please see my posts on "Theoferrum Crucibulum") and Eternal life and enjoyment of the personal presence of the Creator as our Abba, forever.

That is the difference in the natures of the two covenants.

In fact, in light of all that has been presented, it is obvious that the New Covenant is the Theocratic Covenant and all others stem from it, for it was confirmed from the foundation of the world, and all the subsequent covenants only procured the promises that Y'shua had already been given. Take the offering of Isaac by Abraham, which had already been done (from God's perspective) by Himself in His own Son ("Abraham rejoiced to see my day"); take Moses being hidden in the Cleft of the Rock ("and that Rock was Christ"); and David building God a House that was already built by Y'shua ("as a son over the House"); and we see that, contrary to Peters' (and others') opinion, it is the New Covenant that is the foundation on which all the other Covenants are built (including, by the way, the one with Noah - Gen 9:9, and Phinehas - Num 25:11 and all other Covenants that are recorded in the Word, which can not be claimed by the Ab. or Mos. or Davidic, and yet they must be included in the Covenant Chain). This is typified by the City of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21) for, although the twelve tribes are seen in the gates ("salvation is of the Jews") implying the permanence of the Ab. and Mos. covenants, the foundation of the city is in the Apostles of the New Covenant.

The significance of choosing Jeremiah, just before the pouring out of God's wrath via the Babylonians (not just on Israel mind you, but on the entire known world), to confirm Moses' words of a coming New Covenant (Dt 30:6 etc), so as to give the exiles hope and to prepare the way for the first offer of the New Covenant to Judah by Y'shua is clearly seen in this passage of Moses who connects it to a time of exile, after blessings and curses had been experienced by the nation, which includes (Lev 26) the destruction of the City and nation and subsequent exile. It is significant that it was Jeremiah (like Moses both a prophet and priest) who first penned down a specific record of this covenant. Of passing interest is that his name means "Yah will rise" and is not this a veiled reference to the death and resurrection of the Seed that ratified this New Covenant and ensure our own resurrection at his hands?

He talks of the Olive Tree (11:16) which is assuredly where Paul (Rom 11) drew his conclusions from of the grafted Gentiles in the place of the branches "cut off" in judgment. He also refers to the Indwelling Spirit as God's Word like a Fire (1:9, 5:14, 9:23, 11:19, 20:9, 23:9) as it appeared on Pentecost (Acts 2). The foreknowledge of God in Paul's great passage (8:29) including sanctification and predestination find their foundation in Jeremiah (1:5).

As Moses was the "Father" to Israel at its founding, and Elijah the "Mother" that nursed the nation into revival, Jeremiah thus becomes the "Male Child" of Israel (1:6), who experiences the judgment on the nation, and, as such, is a type of Y'shua at the first offering of the N.C., and of the Male Child of Rev 12, who offers the N.C. to Judah the second time.

Thus it is that Jeremiah was (like the Church) sent to the nations (1:10, 1:5, 1:7 and chapters 46-51) to warn them to repent because of coming judgment. The reception of the N.C. by Israel is linked to God's judgment as "The Time of Jacob's Trouble" (Chap 30 in the New Covenant Passage) or Birthpains (13:21, Rev 12), and is connected to this same time when the captivity shall return and the Davidic Throne be restored (chapters 31-33 and note also 23:5), at a time

when the woman flees to the wilderness (Rev 12 compare with Jer 9) and the land itself is restored (contrasting the clay pot of chapter 19 with the earthen vessel of chap 32 see also Ez 36-37).

The judgment itself is described as Wormwood (9:15, 23:15 and Rev 8:11), a Whirlwind in the latter days (23:19 and Rev 6:13), Four Sore Judgments (15:1-4 repeated several times, compare Rev 6, Ez 14:21), the Swelling of the Jordan at Armageddon itself (12:5 and see my post the Seven Thunders), as a Cup of Wine (25:12-18 compare Rev 18:3), the Seven Thunders (10:11-13 and Rev 10), the earth trembling at the Wrath of the Lamb (10:10 and Rev 6:15-17) and the Signs and Wonders thereof (10:2, Mt 24:30, Rev 12:1, 15:1).

It is also significant, as a symbol to provoke them to repentance at the first offer of the New Covenant, that Y'shua compares the nation to an old garment and wine skins, both of which are drawn directly from Jeremiah (13:1-17, Mt 9:16-17). And thus, Y'shua himself locates the New Wine of the New Covenant in the Book of Jeremiah, and the second offer of the same will occur during the seven year tribulation, when conditions are basically, the same as they were in the world and nation in Jeremiah's day and then again in Y'shua's day.

And; if the writing of the Ten Commandments on Stone resulted in the establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom the first time and the utter overthrow of the Egyptian World System then; and the carving of the Law on the Hearts of the Gentiles completely turned the Roman World System upside down; and when the Theocratic King, aided by 6,000 years worth of all the Saints decides that the time has come to engrave the Law on the heart of His people; what do you think that we can rightfully expect as an outcome to His "Labor of Love?"

Read Zechariah 12:8 and Ezekiel 37, for starters.

## **CONCLUSION :**

"This covenant will pour a flood of light on many precious promises linked with it. Language, otherwise dark, becomes easy of comprehension; dispensational procedures, otherwise dim and unaccountable, become precise and significant in their meaning; the preaching of John, Jesus, disciples, and Apostles, instead of being contradictory or accommodating to error, is found consistent. It explains much that enables us the more clearly to perceive and appreciate a regular divine plan in preparing for and ultimately establishing the Theocratic Kingdom under Messiah. It tells us, as nothing else can, why the Gentiles must be grafted in, why 'blindness in part' is happened to Israel until the fullness of Gentiles is come in. And so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written: there shall come out of Zion a Deliverer and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob for this is my covenant with them.' It, and it alone, as the outgrowths from it are developed, gives us a strict historical, providential, doctrinal, and divine unity of purpose in the Word."

Just as the life bearing seed (Mk 4:26-29) clothes itself from the vital nutrients of the lifeless soil, until it grows up and brings forth a bountiful harvest; so also has the life giving seed (John

12:24) of the Eternal Word as contained in the Theocratic Covenant clothed itself in Glorious Majesty from the vital nutrients of the soil of the Abrahamic, Mosaic and Davidic Covenants, so that, when it reaches maturity, it will render a bountiful harvest in the Theocratic Kingdom of God on Earth.

I wish it Godspeed...